arXiv:1411.5400v1 [math.NA] 19 Nov 2014

Convergence and error estimates of a viscosity-splitting finite-element scheme for the Primitive Equations *

F. Guillén-González†, M.V. Redondo-Neble‡

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is the numerical analysis of a first order fractional-step time-scheme, using decomposition of the viscosity, and "inf-sup" stable finite element space-approximations for the Primitive Equations of the Ocean. The aim of the paper is twofold. Firstly, we prove that the scheme is unconditionally stable and convergent towards weak solutions of the Primitive Equations. Secondly, optimal error estimates for velocity and pressure are provided of order $O(k+h^l)$ for $l=1$ or $l=2$ when either first or second order finite-element approximations are considered (k and h being the time step and the mesh size, respectively). In both cases, these error estimates are obtained under the same constraint $k \leq h^2$.

Subject Classification 35Q35, 65M12, 65M15, 76D05
Keywords: Primitive Equations, finite elements, anisotropic estimates, time-splitting schemes, stability, convergence, error estimates.

Introduction

Assuming some simplifications (basically hydrostatic pressure and "rigid lid" hypothesis), the $3D$ Navier-Stokes equations derive to the so-called "Primitive Equations" (or Hydrostatic Navier-Stokes equations). These equations arise a general mathematical problem in the field of geophysical fluids ([11, 29, 32]). In particular, they describe the large-scale motions in the ocean [30]. The rigid lid hypothesis (no vertical displacements of the free surface of the ocean) is usually assumed in Oceanography, except in the case when fast surface waves are of interest [11].

For simplicity, we take constant density, Cartesian coordinates (x in the easterly direction, y in the northerly direction and z perpendicular to the surface of the Earth) and we assume that the effects due to temperature and salinity can be decoupled from the flow dynamic. Then, the

*The authors have been partially supported by MINECO (Spain), Grant MTM2012–32325 and the second author is also partially supported by the research group FQM-315 of Junta de Andalucía.

†Departamento de Ecuaciones Diferenciales y Análisis Numérico and IMUS. Universidad de Sevilla. Aptdo. 11690, 41080 Sevilla (Spain), email: guillen@us.es, phone: ++ 34 954559907.

‡Departamento de Matemáticas. Universidad de Cádiz. C.A.S.E.M. Polígono Río San Pedro S/N, 11510 Puerto Real. Cádiz (Spain), email: victoria.redondo@uca.es, phone: ++ 34 956016058.

Primitive Equations model can be written as ([28, 29, 30]):

$$(P) \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{u} + (\mathbf{U}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{u} - \nu\Delta\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{u}) + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} p = \mathbf{f} & \text{in } \Omega\times(0,T), \\ \partial_z p = -\rho\, g, \qquad \nabla\cdot\mathbf{U} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega\times(0,T), \\ \mathbf{u} = u_3 n_3 = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_b\times(0,T), \\ \mathbf{u} = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_l\times(0,T), \\ \nu\,\partial_z\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{g}_s, \quad u_3 = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_s\times(0,T), \\ \mathbf{u}_{|t=0} = \mathbf{u}_0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\Omega = \{(\mathbf{x},z)\in \boldsymbol{R}^3 :\ \mathbf{x}=(x,y)\in S,\ -D(\mathbf{x}) < z < 0\}$ is the $3D$ domain filled by the water, with $S\subset \boldsymbol{R}^2$ the surface domain (a regular bounded $2D$ domain) and $D : \overline{S}\to \boldsymbol{R}_+$ (with $D>0$ in S) the bottom function. Then, the different boundaries of Ω are denoted as $\Gamma_s = \overline{S}\times\{0\}$ the surface, $\Gamma_b = \{(\mathbf{x},-D(\mathbf{x})) :\ \mathbf{x}\in S\}$ the bottom and $\Gamma_l = \{(\mathbf{x},z) :\ \mathbf{x}\in\partial S, -D(\mathbf{x}) < z < 0\}$ the lateral walls (with outwards normal vector $(\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{x}}, n_3)$). Note that if $D\in C(\overline{S})$ then the bottom has no steps and the condition $u_3 n_3 = 0$ on $\Gamma_b\times(0,T)$ derives to $u_3 = 0$ on $\Gamma_b\times(0,T)$. In fact, Ω is the non-dimensional domain obtained after a vertical scaling and problem (P) appears as asymptotic limit from the anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations when the aspect ratio (vertical/horizontal) goes to zero [1, 2, 5].

The unknowns of the problem are $\mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{u}, u_3) : \Omega\times(0,T)\to\boldsymbol{R}^3$ the 3D velocity field (with $\mathbf{u} = (u_1,u_2)$ the horizontal velocity and u_3 the vertical one) and $p : \Omega\times(0,T)\to\boldsymbol{R}$ the pressure.

Also, $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{u}) = f\mathbf{u}^{\perp}$ represents the effect of the Coriolis Forces, with $\mathbf{u}^{\perp} = (-u_2,u_1)^t$ and $f = 2|w|\sin\theta$, where w is the angular velocity of the Earth and $\theta=\theta(y)$ is the latitude, $\rho\in\boldsymbol{R}_+$ is the water density (that it is assumed a positive constant), $g\in\boldsymbol{R}_+$ is the gravity acceleration (another positive constant), $\mathbf{f} : \Omega\times(0,T)\to\boldsymbol{R}^2$ is a field of external horizontal forces (depending for instance on the salinity and temperature) and $\mathbf{g}_s : \Gamma_s\times(0,T)\to\boldsymbol{R}^2$ represents the stress of the wind on the surface.

Finally, $\nabla = (\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}, \partial_z)^t$ stands for the three-dimensional gradient operator (with $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} = (\partial_x,\partial_y)^t$ its horizontal component) y Δ stands for the three-dimensional Laplacian operator.

The problem (P) have been vertically scaled (see [2]) such that the horizontal and vertical dimensions in Ω are of the same order.

Remark 1 *When variations in the surface are important in the problem, it is usual to consider the general Navier Stokes equations with hydrostatic pressure, introducing the free surface as a new unknown. In this case, one has to change the boundary condition of "rigid lid" ($u_3 = 0$ on Γ_s) for the equation of the free surface, arriving at the so-called three-dimensional Shallow Water model. Some numerical approximations of this model can be seen in [8, 9, 10].*

We will give two reformulations of problem (P) leading to different spatial approximations.

The vertical dependence of the pressure can be decomposed by using the hydostatic pressure $\rho g z$, defining $p_s(t;\mathbf{x}) = p(t;\mathbf{x},z) - \rho g z$, where $p_s : S\times(0,T)\to\boldsymbol{R}$ is a new unknown (defined only on the surface S), that it will be called *surface pressure*.

Notice that incompressibility equation $\nabla\cdot\mathbf{U} = 0$ in $\Omega\times(0,T)$ and boundary condition $u_3 = 0$ on $\Gamma_s\times(0,T)$ are equivalent to the following integral formula for the vertical velocity:

$$u_3(t;\mathbf{x},z) = \int_z^0 \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\mathbf{u}(t;\mathbf{x},s)\,ds. \tag{1}$$

Moreover, the following equality holds:

$$\int_{-D(\mathbf{x})}^{0} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{U}\, dz = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle - (\mathbf{u}, u_3)(\mathbf{x}, -D(\mathbf{x})) \cdot (\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} D(\mathbf{x}), 1) = 0 \quad \text{in } S \times (0,T), \tag{2}$$

where $\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle$ denotes the total vertical flux of the horizontal velocity:

$$\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle(t;\mathbf{x}) = \int_{-D(\mathbf{x})}^{0} \mathbf{u}(t;\mathbf{x},z)\, dz.$$

Therefore, since $(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} D(\mathbf{x}), 1)$ is parallel to the normal vector $(\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{x}}, n_3)$ on Γ_b, assuming $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{U} = 0$ in $\Omega \times (0,T)$, the so-called slip condition $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{x}} + u_3 n_3 = 0$ on $\Gamma_b \times (0,T)$ is equivalent to the constraint $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle = 0$ in $S \times (0,T)$ ([28, 29, 30]).

Then, problem (P) can be reformulated as the following *integro-differential problem*:

$$(Q) \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{u} + (\mathbf{U} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u} - \nu \Delta \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{u}) + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} p_s = \mathbf{f} & \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T), \\ \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle = 0 & \text{in } S \times (0,T), \\ \nu \partial_z \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{g}_s & \text{on } \Gamma_s \times (0,T), \\ \mathbf{u} = 0 & \text{on } (\Gamma_b \cup \Gamma_l) \times (0,T), \\ \mathbf{u}_{|t=0} = \mathbf{u}_0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{u}, u_3)$ with u_3 depending on the $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{u}$ by the integral formula (1).

Instead of problem (Q), other reformulation of problem (P) can be done, based on the following equivalence: assuming the slip-condition $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{x}} + u_3\, n_3 = 0$ on Γ_b, one has

$$\left.\begin{array}{c} \partial_z(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{U}) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \\ \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle = 0 \quad \text{in } S \end{array}\right\} \Longleftrightarrow \nabla \cdot \mathbf{U} = 0 \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Indeed, from the equation $\partial_z(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{U}) = 0$, one has $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{U} = a(\mathbf{x})$. By integrating in vertical this equality and using (2) (taking into account $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle = 0$ and the slip-condition on Γ_b), one has

$$0 = \int_{-D(\mathbf{x})}^{0} g(\mathbf{x})\, dz = D(\mathbf{x})\, a(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{in } S.$$

Then $a \equiv 0$ in S and $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{U} = 0$. Conversely, since $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{U} = 0$ then $\partial_z(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{U}) = 0$. Moreover, $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle = 0$ is deduced again from (2) integrating in vertical $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{U} = 0$ and taking into account the slip-condition on Γ_b.

Therefore, the second reformulation of problem (P) is:

$$(R) \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{u} + (\mathbf{U} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u} - \nu \Delta \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{u}) + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} p_s = \mathbf{f} & \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T), \\ \partial_z^2 u_3 + \partial_z \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T), \\ \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle = 0 & \text{in } S \times (0,T), \\ \nu \partial_z \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{g}_s & \text{on } \Gamma_s \times (0,T), \\ \mathbf{u} = 0 & \text{on } (\Gamma_b \cup \Gamma_l) \times (0,T), \\ u_3 = 0 & \text{on } (\Gamma_s \cup \Gamma_b) \times (0,T), \\ \mathbf{u}_{|t=0} = \mathbf{u}_0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Notice that in (R) the vertical velocity u_3 is uniquely defined by the z-elliptic problem

$$\partial_z^2 u_3 = -\partial_z \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{u} \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T), \quad u_3|_{\Gamma_s \cup \Gamma_b} = 0. \tag{3}$$

From the numerical analysis point of view, the convergence of some Finite Element (FE) schemes for the stationary problem related to (Q), has been proved in [12], where the so-called *hydrostatic Inf-Sup* stability condition appears. To approximate the time-dependent problem, a stabilized FE scheme was used by Chacón-Rodríguez in [13, 14], and Bermejo in [3] and Bermejo-Galán in [4] used a semi-lagrangian projection time-scheme together with finite elements in space. On the other hand, Chacón-Gómez-Sánchez in [15] have derived the numerical approximation of this model by the Orthogonal Sub-Scales FE method, obtaining stability, convergence and error estimates (optimal for 2D flows) for a steady linearized model and they have performed some numerical tests for the non-linear case.

The goal of this paper is to design numerical schemes associated to both formulations (R) and (Q), based on a fractional-step time-scheme and FE in space, which satisfies analytical results into two directions: on one hand, unconditional stability and convergence towards weak solutions of (R) and, on the other hand, error estimates with respect to a sufficiently regular solution, under the constraint

$$(\mathbf{H}) \qquad k \leq h^2.$$

These results could be seen as an extension of the numerical analysis done for a viscosity-splitting scheme applied to the time-dependent Navier-Stokes Equations in [6] and [22, 24, 25]. Nevertheless, error estimates for the Navier-Stokes case have been deduced in [22, 25], using the corresponding time-discrete scheme as intermediate problem to obtain error estimates for the fully discrete scheme, under the constraint

$$h \leq C\, k.$$

Since this constraint has contrary sense that **(H)**, it is not clear how the argument done in [22, 25] for Navier-Stokes could be extended for the Primitive Equations.

In the scheme studied in this paper, three subproblems must be solved at every time step m. Indeed, given $(\mathbf{u}_h^m, p_{s,h}^m)$, firstly the vertical velocity $u_{3,h}^m$ is computed in function of $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{u}_h^m$, afterwards an intermediate horizontal velocity $\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}$ and finally a pair $(\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}, p_{s,h}^{m+1})$ is computed solving an Hydrostatic Stokes problem.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. After giving some preliminaries in Section 1, the fully discrete scheme related to (R) is described in Section 2, obtaining in Section 3 some stability a priori estimates and convergence (by subsequences) as $(k, h) \to 0$ towards weak solutions of (R).

In Section 4, some error estimates for velocity and pressure are deduced. Firstly, we obtain $O(\sqrt{k} + h^l)$ error estimates for both velocities $\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}$ and $\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}$, improving to optimal accuracy $O(k + h^l)$ for the "end of step" velocity $\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}$, for $l = 1, 2$ the order of the FE approximation. Afterwards, $O(\sqrt{k} + h^l)$ for the discrete time derivative of $\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}$ and for the pressure will be deduced.

On the other hand, only when $l = 2$, we obtain optimal $O(k + h^2)$ error estimates for the discrete time derivative of $\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}$ and for the pressure.

In order to also deduce optimal accuracy for the pressure when $l = 1$, in Section 5 we consider a modified scheme associated to (Q), where the vertical velocity is approximated via an integral computation like (1). For this scheme, optimal accuracy in the $L^2(\Omega)$-norm; $O(k + h^{l+1})$ for $\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}$ and $O(k + h^l)$ for the pressure are obtained. Finally, some comments about the treatment of the Coriolis term are given in Section 6, and some conclusions in Section 7.

1 Preliminaries

1.1 The discrete Gronwall Lemma

In this paper, the following discrete Gronwall lemma will be frequently used (see [26, p. 369]):

Lemma 1 *Let k, B and a_m , b_m , c_m , γ_m be nonnegative numbers.*

a) (Discrete Gronwall inequality) *We assume*

$$a_{r+1} + k\sum_{m=0}^{r} b_m \leq k\sum_{m=0}^{r} \gamma_m a_m + k\sum_{m=0}^{r} c_m + B \qquad \forall r \geq 0.$$

Then, one has

$$a_{r+1} + k\sum_{m=0}^{r} b_m \leq \exp\left(k\sum_{m=0}^{r}\gamma_m\right)\left\{k\sum_{m=0}^{r} c_m + B\right\} \qquad \forall r \geq 0.$$

b) (Generalised discrete Gronwall inequality) *We assume*

$$a_r + k\sum_{m=0}^{r} b_m \leq k\sum_{m=0}^{r} \gamma_m a_m + k\sum_{m=0}^{r} c_m + B \qquad \forall r \geq 0$$

such that $k\gamma_m < 1$ for all m. Then, setting $\sigma_m \equiv (1-k\gamma_m)^{-1}$, one has

$$a_r + k\sum_{m=0}^{r} b_m \leq \exp\left(k\sum_{m=0}^{r}\sigma_m\gamma_m\right)\left\{k\sum_{m=0}^{r} c_m + B\right\} \qquad \forall r \geq 0.$$

1.2 Space of functions and weak solutions

To define the notion of weak solution of problem (R), we introduce the following Hilbert spaces:

$$\begin{aligned} H^1_{b,l}(\Omega) &= \{\mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega) \,/\, \mathbf{v}|_{\Gamma_b\cup\Gamma_l} = 0\}, \\ \mathbf{H} &= \{\mathbf{v} \in L^2(\Omega)^2 \,/\, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\langle\mathbf{v}\rangle = 0 \text{ in } S,\ \langle\mathbf{v}\rangle\cdot\mathbf{n}_{\partial S} = 0\}, \\ \mathbf{V} &= \{\mathbf{v} \in H^1_{b,l}(\Omega)^2 \,/\, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\langle\mathbf{v}\rangle = 0 \text{ in } S\}, \end{aligned}$$

being $\mathbf{n}_{\partial S}$ the normal outward unitary vector of ∂S. Observe that spaces $\mathbf{H}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ are the "hydrostatic version" of the classical spaces used for the Navier-Stokes equations.

We denote $\mathbf{H}^1_{b,l}(\Omega) = H^1_{b,l}(\Omega)^2$, etc. The norm and scalar product in $L^2(\Omega)$ will be denoted by $|\cdot|$ and $\Big(\cdot,\cdot\Big)$, whereas in $\mathbf{H}^1_{b,l}(\Omega)$ we denote by $\|\cdot\|$ the norm of the gradient in $L^2(\Omega)$, that is $\|u\| = |\nabla u|$. On the other hand, we denote by $\mathbf{H}^{-1}_{b,l}(\Omega)$ and $H^{-1/2}(\Gamma_s)$ the dual spaces of $\mathbf{H}^1_{b,l}(\Omega)$ and $H^{1/2}(\Gamma_s)$ respectively, with duality products $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_\Omega$ and $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\Gamma_s}$. Spaces defined in Ω will be frequently abbreviate as L^2 instead of $L^2(\Omega)$ etc.

The space related to the surface pressure will be:

$$L^2_0(S) = \left\{q \in L^2(S) \,/\, \int_S q = 0\right\}.$$

The vertical velocity u_3 can be obtained from $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\mathbf{u}$ by means of either the integral formulation (1) or the differential formulation (3). In this process, the $L^2(\Omega)$ regularity for the horizontal derivatives of u_3 is not obtained, hence the following "anisotropic" Hilbert spaces should be defined:

$$H(\partial_z)=\{v\in L^2(\Omega)\ /\ \partial_z v\in L^2(\Omega)\}\quad (\text{resp. } H^k(\partial_z)=\{v\in H^k(\Omega)\ /\ \partial_z v\in H^k(\Omega)\}),$$

and $H_0(\partial_z)=\{v\in H(\partial_z)\ /\ v=0 \text{ on } \Gamma_s\cup\Gamma_b\}$. The inner products are defined by $(v,w)_{H(\partial_z)}=\Big(v,w\Big)+\Big(\partial_z v,\partial_z w\Big)$ in $H(\partial_z)$ and by $(v,w)_{H_0(\partial_z)}=\Big(\partial_z v,\partial_z w\Big)$ in $H_0(\partial_z)$, owing to a vertical Poincaré inequality (see (4) below).

Notice that, given $\mathbf{u}\in\mathbf{H}^1_{b,l}(\Omega)$, the weak solution u_3 of problem (3) can be defined by:

$$u_3\in H_0(\partial_z)\quad\text{such that}\quad (u_3,w)_{H_0(\partial_z)}=-\Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\mathbf{u},\partial_z w\Big)\quad\forall\, w\in H_0(\partial_z).$$

Due to the loss of regularity of u_3 ($u_3\in L^2(\Omega)$ but $u_3\notin H^1(\Omega)$), the vertical convection term $u_3\partial_z\mathbf{u}$ does not belong to $\mathbf{H}^{-1}_{b,l}(\Omega)$, hence more regular test functions must be introduced in the variational formulation of (R). For instance, it suffices to consider $\mathbf{v}\in\mathbf{H}^1_{b,l}(\Omega)$ such that $\partial_z\mathbf{v}\in\mathbf{L}^3(\Omega)$, because in this case one has (see [12]):

$$\Big|\Big\langle(\mathbf{U}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\Big\rangle_\Omega\Big|=\Big|\int_\Omega(\mathbf{U}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{u}\Big|<+\infty.$$

Another possibility is to assume $\mathbf{v}\in\mathbf{H}^1_{b,l}(\Omega)\cap\mathbf{L}^\infty(\Omega)$, and then $\displaystyle\int_\Omega(\mathbf{U}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{v}<+\infty$.

For fully discrete schemes, it is usual to use the following skew-symmetric of the convective terms: for each $\mathbf{U}\in\mathbf{H}^1_{b,l}\times H_0(\partial_z)$, $\mathbf{v}\in\mathbf{H}^1$, $\mathbf{w}\in\mathbf{H}^1$ with either $\mathbf{w}\in\mathbf{L}^\infty$ or $\partial_z\mathbf{w}\in\mathbf{L}^3$,

$$\begin{aligned}c\Big(\mathbf{U},\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w}\Big)&=\int_\Omega\Big\{(\mathbf{U}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{w}+\frac{1}{2}(\nabla\cdot\mathbf{U})\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{w}\Big\}\qquad\text{if }\mathbf{w}\in\mathbf{L}^\infty\\&=-\int_\Omega\Big\{(\mathbf{U}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{w}\cdot\mathbf{v}+\frac{1}{2}(\nabla\cdot\mathbf{U})\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{w}\Big\}\qquad\text{if }\partial_z\mathbf{w}\in\mathbf{L}^3.\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, $c(\mathbf{U},\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w})=\displaystyle\int_\Omega(\mathbf{U}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{w}$ whether $\nabla\cdot\mathbf{U}=0$. By simplicity, we denote the vertical part of these trilinear forms in the same manner, i.e.

$$c\Big(u_3,\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w}\Big)=\int_\Omega\Big\{u_3\,\partial_z\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{w}+\frac{1}{2}(\partial_z u_3)\,\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{w}\Big\}=-\int_\Omega\Big\{u_3\,\partial_z\mathbf{w}\cdot\mathbf{v}+\frac{1}{2}(\partial_z u_3)\,\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{w}\Big\}$$

Previous equalities hold even for discrete spaces, hence in the sequel, we will use any of these two possibilities.

Let us to define the weak solutions of (R) in $(0,T)$, solving the following variational formulation (in a reduced form without pressure): Find $\mathbf{U}=(\mathbf{u},u_3)\in L^2(0,T;\mathbf{V}\times H_0(\partial_z))$ with $\mathbf{u}\in L^\infty(0,T;\mathbf{H})$ and $\mathbf{u}_{|t=0}=\mathbf{u}_0$ in Ω, such that a.e. $t\in(0,T)$:

$$\begin{cases}\Big(\mathbf{u}_t,\mathbf{v}\Big)+c\Big(\mathbf{U},\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\Big)+\nu\Big(\nabla\mathbf{u},\nabla\mathbf{v}\Big)=\Big\langle\mathbf{f},\mathbf{v}\Big\rangle_\Omega+\Big\langle\mathbf{g}_s,\mathbf{v}\Big\rangle_{\Gamma_s},\quad\forall\,\mathbf{v}\in\mathbf{V}\cap\mathbf{W}^{1,3}_{b,l}\cap\mathbf{L}^\infty,\\ \Big(\partial_z\,u_3,\partial_z w\Big)=-\Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\mathbf{u},\partial_z w\Big),\quad\forall\,w\in H_0(\partial_z).\end{cases}$$

Here the Coriolis term has not been considered, because it does not add important difficulties to the arguments of this paper. In Section 6, we briefly analyze some possibilities to approximate the Coriolis term.

1.3 Known analytical results

The existence of weak solutions $(\mathbf{u}, p_s)$ of problem (Q) is well known, see Lions-Teman-Wang [30] and Lewandowski [28], always in domains with side-walls (i.e. $D \geq D_{min} > 0$ in $\overline{S}$). In these works, a compactness method is used to obtain the velocity $\mathbf{u}$ in a space with the restriction $\nabla \cdot \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle = 0$ and afterwards, the surface pressure p_s is obtained by means of a specific De Rham's lemma on the surface S. In domains without side-walls (i.e. when the depth function D can degenerate to zero), the existence of weak solutions $(\mathbf{u}, u_3, p)$ of (P) is obtained by an asymptotic limit applied to the Navier-Stokes equations with anisotropic viscosity when the ratio depth over horizontal diameter (of the domain) goes to zero; see Besson-Laydi [5] for the stationary case and Azerad-Guillén [1, 2] for the time-dependent one. The existence of weak solutions of the stationary problem related to (Q) in domains without side-walls is proved in Chacón-Guillén [12] by an internal approximation argument; a mixed (velocity-pressure) variational formulation is approximated by a conformed Finite Element method verifying the so-called "hydrostatic Inf-Sup condition". On the other hand, Ortegón in [31] obtained a generalization of De Rham's Lemma to general domains without side-walls.

Respect to regularity results for the Primitive Equations, the existence of strong solutions (with $H^2(\Omega)$-regularity for the horizontal velocity) is treated by Ziane in [35] for the linear stationary problem associated to (Q). This result is extended in [20] to the linear evolutive case. For the nonlinear problem, the existence (and uniqueness) of local in time strong solutions for $2D$ domains (global in time for small enough data), is proved in [20]. The extension (and improvement) of this kind of results to $3D$ domains can be seen in [18]. Finally, assuming flat bottom and Neumann boundary condition on the bottom, the existence of global in time regular solutions without constraints is proved in [7]. In [27], this result is also obtained with Dirichlet boundary conditions on the bottom.

1.4 Some 3D anisotropic spaces and related estimates

Given $p, q \in [1, +\infty]$, it will be said that a function $u \in L^q_z L^p_{\mathbf{x}}(\Omega)$ (or simply $L^q_z L^p_{\mathbf{x}}$) if:

$$u(\cdot, z) \in L^p(S_z) \quad \text{and} \quad \|u(\cdot, z)\|_{L^p(S_z)} \in L^q(-D_{\max}, 0),$$

where $S_z = \{\mathbf{x} \in S \ : \ (\mathbf{x}, z) \in \Omega\}$, and its norm is given by $\left\| \|u(\cdot, z)\|_{L^p(S_z)} \right\|_{L^q(-D_{\max}, 0)}$. Some anisotropic norms frequently used in this paper will be:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L^2_z L^4_{\mathbf{x}}(\Omega)} &= \left(\int_{-D_{\max}}^{0} \|u(\cdot, z)\|^2_{L^4(S_z)} dz \right)^{1/2} \\ \|u\|_{L^\infty_z L^2_{\mathbf{x}}(\Omega)} &= \sup_{z \in (-D_{\max}, 0)} \|u(\cdot, z)\|_{L^2(S_z)}, \end{aligned}$$

In a similar way, we define the spaces

$$H^1_z L^2_{\mathbf{x}} \equiv H^1(-D_{\max}, 0; L^2(S_z)), \quad L^2_z H^1_{\mathbf{x}} \equiv L^2(-D_{\max}, 0; H^1(S_z)).$$

Notice that $H^1_z L^2_{\mathbf{x}} = H(\partial_z)$.

On the other hand, we will use frequently the following inequalities (see [18]):

- Horizontal Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (related to $2D$ domains):

$$\begin{aligned} &\|u\|_{L^2_z L^4_{\mathbf{x}}} \leq C \, |u|^{1/2} \, |\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} u|^{1/2} \quad \forall \, u \in L^2_z H^1_{\mathbf{x}} \ \text{ such that } u|_{\Gamma_b \cup \Gamma_l} = 0, \\ &\|u\|_{L^2_z L^4_{\mathbf{x}}} \leq C \, |u|^{1/2} \, \|u\|^{1/2} \quad \forall \, u \in H^1. \end{aligned}$$

- Vertical Poincaré Inequality (related to $1D$ domains):

$$|v| \leq D_{\max}^{1/2} \, |\partial_z \, v|, \quad \forall \, v \in H_z^1 L_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \text{ such that } v|_{\Gamma_b} = 0 \text{ or } v|_{\Gamma_s} = 0. \tag{4}$$

- Vertical Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (related to $1D$ domains):

$$\|v\|_{L_z^\infty L_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \leq C \, (|v| + |v|^{1/2} \, |\partial_z v|^{1/2}) \quad \forall \, v \in H_z^1 L_{\mathbf{x}}^2. \tag{5}$$

  Moreover, if $v|_{\Gamma_b} = 0$ or $v|_{\Gamma_s} = 0$, then $\|v\|_{L_z^\infty L_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \leq C \, |v|^{1/2} \, |\partial_z v|^{1/2}$.

  In particular, from (4) and (5), one has

$$\|v\|_{L_z^\infty L_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \leq C \, |\partial_z v|, \quad \forall \, v \in H_z^1 L_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \text{ such that } v|_{\Gamma_b} = 0 \text{ or } v|_{\Gamma_s} = 0. \tag{6}$$

2 Description of the scheme

The time interval $[0, T]$ is divided into M subintervals of equal length $k = T/M$, arising the partition of $[0, T]$, $\{t_m = m \, k\}_{m=0}^M$. For simplicity and without loss of generality, we fix the viscosity constant $\nu = 1$.

We consider a time-scheme, where in each time step m, given $(\mathbf{f}^m, \mathbf{g}_s^m)_{m=1}^M$ approximations of data $(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}_s)$ at $t = t_m$, a sequence $(\mathbf{u}_h^m, u_{3,h}^m, p_{s,h}^m)_m$ will be computed, as approximations to a regular solution $(\mathbf{u}, u_3, p_s)$ of (R) at $t = t_m$.

We are going to consider a fractional-step scheme, splitting the three main difficulties of the problem, namely:

- the computation of the vertical velocity,
- the non linear convective terms, $(\mathbf{U} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}$ (in particular, the vertical convection $u_3 \partial_z \mathbf{u}$ is more singular than in the Navier-Stokes case),
- the restriction $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle = 0$ in $S \times (0, T)$ related to the surface pressure p_s.

Indeed, given $(\mathbf{u}_h^m, p_{s,h}^m)$, firstly the vertical velocity $u_{3,h}^m$ is computed as function of $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{u}_h^m$, afterwards an intermediate horizontal velocity $\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}$ is obtained by using convective terms, and finally $(\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}, p_{s,h}^{m+1})$ is computed solving a linear hydrostatic Stokes problem (associated to the restriction $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1} \rangle = 0$). This method can be called a "viscosity-splitting" scheme, because the diffusion terms are considered in the last two steps (see Sub-steps 1 and 2 below).

Let $\mathbf{X}_h$, Y_h and Q_h be three adequate families of FE spaces which it will be precised below. Then, the fully discrete scheme is defined as follows:

Initialization: Let $\mathbf{u}_h^0 \in \mathbf{X}_h$ be an approximation of $\mathbf{u}_0$.

Step of time $m + 1$:

Sub-step 0: Given $\mathbf{u}_h^m \in \mathbf{X}_h$, compute $u_{3,h}^m \in Y_h$ such that,

$$(S_0)_h^m \qquad \Big(\partial_z u_{3,h}^m, \partial_z y_h\Big) = -\Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{u}_h^m, \partial_z y_h\Big) \quad \forall y_h \in Y_h.$$

Sub-step 1: Given $\mathbf{U}_h^m = (\mathbf{u}_h^m, u_{3,h}^m) \in \mathbf{X}_h \times Y_h$, compute $\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2} \in \mathbf{X}_h$ such that,

$$(S_1)_h^{m+1} \qquad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{k}\Big(\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2} - \mathbf{u}_h^m, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) + c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^m, \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) + \Big(\nabla\, \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}, \nabla\, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) \\ = \Big\langle \mathbf{f}^{m+1}, \mathbf{v}_h \Big\rangle_\Omega + \Big\langle \mathbf{g}_s^{m+1}, \mathbf{v}_h \Big\rangle_{\Gamma_s} \quad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{X}_h. \end{array} \right.$$

Sub-step 2: Given $\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2} \in \mathbf{X}_h$, compute $(\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}, p_h^{m+1}) \in \mathbf{X}_h \times Q_h$, such that

$$(S_2)_h^{m+1} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{k}\Big(\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1} - \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) + \Big(\nabla(\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1} - \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}), \nabla \mathbf{v}_h\Big) - \Big(p_h^{m+1}, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{v}_h \rangle\Big)_S = 0, \\ \Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1} \rangle, q_h\Big)_S = 0 \quad \forall (\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \in \mathbf{X}_h \times Q_h. \end{array} \right.$$

A linear z-elliptic problem must be computed in Sub-step 0, a decoupled linear convection-diffusion problem in Sub-step 1 and a (generalized) Hydrostatic Stokes problem in Sub-step 2, which will be well-defined if a particular *Inf-Sup* stability condition holds, see **(H1)** below.

On the other hand, in order to do the effective computation of the integrals on the $2D$ surface S given in $(S_2)_h^{m+1}$, $\Big(p_h^{m+1}, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{v}_h \rangle\Big)_S$, it will be necessary to use vertically structured grids.

With respect to the consistency of this scheme, adding $(S_1)_h^{m+1}$ and $(S_2)_h^{m+1}$ one has:

$$(S)_h^{m+1} \qquad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{k}\Big(\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1} - \mathbf{u}_h^m, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) + c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^m, \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) + \Big(\nabla\, \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}, \nabla\, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) \\ -\Big(p_h^{m+1}, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{v}_h \rangle\Big)_S = \Big\langle \mathbf{f}^{m+1}, \mathbf{v}_h \Big\rangle_\Omega + \Big\langle \mathbf{g}_s^m, \mathbf{v}_h \Big\rangle_{\Gamma_s} \end{array} \right.$$

This formulation will be used to prove the convergence of the scheme.

Although viscosity-splitting schemes solve a mixed method which request higher computational cost than classical projection (segregated) schemes, they present some advantages because viscosity-splitting schemes have not numerical boundary layer for the pressure due to diffusion terms are also included in the free-divergence projection step (here Sub-step 2), which let to impose exact boundary conditions for the velocity.

On the other hand, viscosity-splitting schemes improve the numerical treatment of Euler (or semi-implicit) mixed schemes [34], because Sub-step 2 is a symmetric problem which can be formulated as a minimization problem, and then it can be approximated by using many numerical optimization solvers, as the Uzawa's method, the Augmented Lagrangian method, etc. ([17]).

2.1 Choice of adequate Finite Element spaces

We restrict ourselves to the case where the surface domain $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ has a polygonal boundary and the bottom function D is globally continuous and locally P_1, hence the $3D$ domain Ω has polygonal boundary. Moreover, the following hypothesis will be imposed about Ω:

(**H0**) *Regularity of the Domain*: Assume $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ such that the Hydrostatic Stokes Problem has $\mathbf{H}^2(\Omega) \times H^1(S)$ regularity for (horizontal) velocity and pressure respectively. For this, the following hypothesis of existence of sidewalls should be imposed (see [35]):

$$D \geq D_{\min} > 0 \quad \text{in } S.$$

To discretize the domain Ω, let $\mathcal{T}_h(\Omega)$ be a regular and quasi-uniform triangulation of Ω (with elements $K \in \mathcal{T}_h(\Omega)$) and $\mathcal{T}_h(S)$ its associated triangulation of S with elements $T \in \mathcal{T}_h(S)$. Assume that $\mathcal{T}_h(\Omega)$ is a vertically structured mesh, and then each element $K \in \mathcal{T}_h(\Omega)$ is projected onto only one element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h(S)$. Some references about how to construct vertically structured meshes can be seen in [12], [13] and [14] by using the so-called *iso-σ layers* or in [19] by using a $\boldsymbol{P}_0$ approximation on the bottom.

We consider three families of FE spaces: $\mathbf{X}_h \subset \mathbf{H}^1_{b,l}(\Omega)$ for the horizontal velocity, $Y_h \subset H_0(\partial_z)$ for the vertical velocity and $Q_h \subset L^2_0(S)$ for the pressure. Functions of $\mathbf{X}_h$ are globally continuous, whereas functions in Y_h must be globally continuous only with respect to vertical direction and Q_h could be furnished by discontinuous functions.

The following hypotheses are required about $(\mathbf{X}_h, Y_h, Q_h)$:

(**H1**) $(\mathbf{X}_h, Q_h)$ satisfies the so called "hydrostatic *Inf-Sup*" condition ([12]): There exists $\beta > 0$ (independent of h) such that, for all $h > 0$,

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{X}_h \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\Big(q_h, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{v}_h \rangle\Big)_S}{|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{v}_h| + \|\partial_z \mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^3}} \geq \beta \ \|q_h\|_{L^2(S)}, \quad \forall q_h \in Q_h \setminus \{0\}.$$

(**H2**) The following inverse inequalities hold: for each $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{X}_h$,

$$\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2_z L^4_{\mathbf{x}}} \leq C\, h^{-1/2} |\mathbf{v}_h|, \quad \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^\infty_z L^4_{\mathbf{x}}} \leq C\, h^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^\infty_z L^2_{\mathbf{x}}}, \quad \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2_z L^\infty_{\mathbf{x}}} \leq C\, h^{-1} |\mathbf{v}_h|,$$

$$\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^3} \leq C\, h^{-1/2} |\mathbf{v}_h|, \quad \|\mathbf{v}_h\| \leq C\, h^{-1} |\mathbf{v}_h|, \quad \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{W^{1,6}} \leq C\, h^{-1} \|\mathbf{v}_h\|.$$

(**H3**) The approximation properties of order $O(h^l)$ (for $l = 1$ or 2):

$$\begin{aligned}
h^{-1}|\mathbf{v} - I_h\mathbf{v}| + \|\mathbf{v} - I_h\mathbf{v}\| &\leq C\, h^l \, \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{H}^{l+1}} \qquad \forall\, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^{l+1}(\Omega) \cap \mathbf{V}, \\
|\mathbf{v} - I_h\mathbf{v}| &\leq C\, h^l \, \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{H}^l} \quad \forall\, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}^l \cap \mathbf{V}, \\
\|q - J_h q\|_{L^2(S)} &\leq C\, h^l \, \|q\|_{H^l(S)} \qquad \forall\, q \in H^l(S) \cap L^2_0(S), \\
\|v_3 - K_h v_3\|_{H(\partial_z)} &\leq C\, h^l \, \|v_3\|_{H^{l+1}} \quad \forall\, v_3 \in H^{l+1}(\Omega) \cap H_0(\partial_z),
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $(I_h, J_h) : \mathbf{V} \times L^2_0(S) \to \mathbf{X}_h \times Q_h$ is the hydrostatic Stokes projector defined as:

$$(I_h\mathbf{v}, J_h q) \in \mathbf{X}_h \times Q_h : \begin{cases} \Big(\nabla(I_h\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}), \nabla\, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) - \Big(J_h q - q, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{v}_h \rangle\Big)_S = 0 \quad \forall\, \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{X}_h, \\ \Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle I_h\mathbf{v} \rangle, q_h\Big)_S = 0 \quad \forall\, q_h \in Q_h, \end{cases}$$

and $K_h : H_0(\partial_z) \to Y_h$ is the $H_0(\partial_z)$-projector onto Y_h defined as:

$$K_h v_3 \in Y_h \ : \ \Big(\partial_z(K_h v_3 - v_3), \partial_z y_h\Big) = 0 \quad \forall\, y_h \in Y_h.$$

There are some possibilities to define $(\mathbf{X}_h, Y_h, Q_h)$ satisfying **(H1)-(H3)**. For instance, to approximate the pressure, we can consider

$$Q_h = \{q_h \in C^0(\overline{S}) : \, q_h|_T \in \boldsymbol{P}_1[x], \forall\, T \in \mathcal{T}_h(S)\} \cap L^2_0(S).$$

To choose $(\mathbf{X}_h, Y_h)$ there are at least two possibilities ([12], [21]):

1. *Taylor-Hood* ($O(h^2)$ approximation, $l=2$); locally $\boldsymbol{P}_2[x,z]$ by tetrahedrons and globally continuous FE.

2. *Mini-element* ($O(h)$ approximation, $l=1$). Let $\mathcal{P}(K) = \boldsymbol{P}_1[x,z] \oplus \alpha_K \lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3\lambda_4$ with $\alpha_K \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda_i \in \boldsymbol{P}_1(K)$ such that $\lambda_i(a_j) = \delta_{ij}$, with a_j the vertices of the tetrahedron K. Then, we consider

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{X}_h &= \{\mathbf{v}_h \in C^0(\overline{\Omega}) : \mathbf{v}_h|_K \in \mathcal{P}(K), \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\}^2 \cap \mathbf{H}^1_{b,l}(\Omega), \\ Y_h &= \{y_h \in C^0(\overline{\Omega}) : y_h|_K \in \boldsymbol{P}_1[x,z], \forall\, K \in \mathcal{T}_h(\Omega)\} \cap H_0(\partial_z). \end{aligned}$$

For vertically structured grids furnished by prisms, there are other possibilities to choose $\mathbf{X}_h$. For instance, using a bubble by prism or a bubble by each column of vertical prisms as in [21]. Notice that these possibilities are not stables for the Navier-Stokes problem.

On the other hand, considering triangulations where each element is a right prism, other possibilities to choose Y_h are ([19]):

- locally $\boldsymbol{P}_0[\mathbf{x}] \otimes \boldsymbol{P}_1[z]$ and globally z-continuous (for $l=1$),
- locally $\boldsymbol{P}_1[\mathbf{x}] \otimes \boldsymbol{P}_2[z]$ and globally continuous and z-C^1 (for $l=2$).

For these anisotropic FE approximations of Y_h, we have not seen in the literature any approximation result like hypothesis (7).

3 Stability and convergence towards weak solutions of (R)

In this Section, we are going to study stability properties of scheme $(S_0)_h$-$(S_2)_h$ and convergence towards weak solutions of problem (R). For this, we will obtain some a priori (stability) estimates that let us pass to the limit (convergence), where compactness results must be applied to "control" the limit in the (nonlinear) convective terms.

Fixed the (uniform) partition of $[0,T]$ of diameter $k = T/M$: $\{t_m = mk\}_{m=0}^M$, for a given vector $u = (u^m)_{m=0}^M$ with $u^m \in X$ (X being a Banach space), let us to introduce the following notation for discrete in time norms:

$$\|u\|_{l^2(X)} = \left(k \sum_{m=0}^{M} \|u^m\|_X^2 \right)^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_{l^\infty(X)} = \max_{m=0,\dots,M} \|u^m\|_X.$$

In this section, we consider the following weak regularity on the data

$$(\mathbf{WR}) \qquad \mathbf{f} \in L^2(0,T;\mathbf{H}^{-1}_{b,l}(\Omega)), \quad \mathbf{g}_s \in L^2(0,T;\mathbf{H}^{-1/2}(\Gamma_s)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{u}_0 \in \mathbf{H},$$

and we choose

$$\mathbf{f}^{m+1} = \frac{1}{k}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathbf{f}(t)\,dt, \quad \mathbf{g}_s^{m+1} = \frac{1}{k}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathbf{g}_s(t)\,dt.$$

Lemma 2 *(Stability) Assume* (**WR**) *and* (**H1**). *If* $(\mathbf{u}_h^0)$ *is bounded in* $\mathbf{L}^2$, *then the following estimates hold:*

$$\|\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}\|_{l^\infty(L^2)\cap l^2(H^1)} + \|\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{l^\infty(L^2)\cap l^2(H^1)} \le C, \tag{8}$$

$$\|\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1} - \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{l^2(L^2)} + \|\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2} - \mathbf{u}_h^{m}\|_{l^2(L^2)} \le C\,k^{1/2}, \tag{9}$$

$$\|u_{3,h}^{m+1}\|_{l^2(H(\partial_z)\cap L^\infty_z L^2_{\mathbf{x}})} \le C. \tag{10}$$

Proof. Estimates (8) and (9) can be deduced making

$$\Big((S_1)_h^{m+1}, \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) + \Big((S_2)_h^{m+1}, \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}\Big)$$

and using that

$$c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^m, \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}, \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Big(p_h^{m+1}, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1} \rangle\Big)_S = 0.$$

Indeed, one arrives at

$$\frac{1}{2\,k}\Big(|\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}|^2 - |\mathbf{u}_h^m|^2 + |\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2} - \mathbf{u}_h^m|^2 + |\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1} - \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}|^2\Big)$$

$$+\frac{1}{2}\Big(\|\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1} - \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2\Big)$$

$$= \Big\langle \mathbf{f}^{m+1}, \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2} \Big\rangle + \Big\langle \mathbf{g}_s^{m+1}, \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2} \Big\rangle_S.$$

Then, adding from $m = 0$ to r (with any $r < M$), we obtain the desired estimates (8) and (9).

On the other hand, taking $y_h = u_{3,h}^{m+1} \in Y_h$ as test function in $(S_0)_h^{m+1}$, one has $|\partial_z u_{3,h}^{m+1}| \leq |\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}|$. Therefore, (10) is a consequence of estimate (8) and inequality (6). ∎

Now, we define the following sequences of functions (defined for all $t \in [0,T]$)):

- $\mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(i)} : [0,T] \to \mathbf{H}_{b,l}^1(\Omega)$, such that $\mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(i)}(t) = \mathbf{u}_h^{m+i/2}$ if $t \in (t_m, t_{m+1}]$, $i = 0,1,2$.
- $u_{3,k,h}^{(0)} : [0,T] \to L^2(\Omega)$, such that $u_{3,k,h}^{(0)}(t) = u_{3,h}^m$ if $t \in (t_m, t_{m+1}]$.
- $\mathbf{u}_{k,h} : [0,T] \to \mathbf{H}_{b,l}^1(\Omega)$, continuous, linear by subintervals and $\mathbf{u}_{k,h}(t_m) = \mathbf{u}_h^m$.

Theorem 3 (Convergence) *Assume* (**WR**) *and* (**H0**)-(**H2**)*, then there exists a subsequence* (k',h') *of* (k,h)*, with* $(k',h') \downarrow 0$*, and a weak solution* $\mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{u}, u_3)$ *of* (R) *in* $(0,T)$*, such that:* $(\mathbf{u}_{k',h'}^{(i)})$ *(for each* $i = 0,1,2$*) and* $(\mathbf{u}_{k',h'})$ *converge to* $\mathbf{u}$ *strongly in* $L^2(0,T;\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega))$*, weakly-star in* $L^\infty(0,T;\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega))$ *and weakly in* $L^2(0,T;\mathbf{H}_{b,l}^1(\Omega))$*, whereas* $(u_{3,k',h'}^{(0)})$ *converges to* u_3 *weakly in* $L^2(0,T;H_0(\partial_z))$*.*

Proof. Owing to definition of the functions $\mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(i)}, u_{3,k,h}^{(0)}$ and $\mathbf{u}_{k,h}$, Lemma 2 says:

$$(\mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(i)})_{k,h} \text{ and } (\mathbf{u}_{k,h})_{k,h} \text{ are bounded in } L^\infty(\mathbf{L}^2) \cap L^2(\mathbf{H}_{b,l}^1), \quad \forall\, i = 0,1,2,$$

$$(u_{3,k,h}^{(0)})_{k,h} \text{ is bounded in } L^2(H_0(\partial_z)). \tag{11}$$

On the other hand, from (9), there exists $C = C(\nu, \mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}_s) > 0$ such that, $\forall\, i,j = 0,1,2$,

$$\|\mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(i)} - \mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(j)}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{L}^2)}^2 \leq C\,k, \quad \|\mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(i)} - \mathbf{u}_{k,h}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{L}^2)}^2 \leq C\,k. \tag{12}$$

Therefore, there exist subsequences of $(\mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(i)})_{k,h}$ and $(\mathbf{u}_{k,h})_{k,h}$ (denoted in the same way) and a limit function $\mathbf{u}$ verifying the following weak convergences as $(h,k) \to 0$:

$$(\mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(i)})_{k,h} \to \mathbf{u}, \quad (\mathbf{u}_{k,h})_{k,h} \to \mathbf{u} \quad \text{in} \begin{cases} L^2(0,T;\mathbf{H}_{b,l}^1(\Omega)) - \text{weak} \\ L^\infty(0,T;\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega)) - \text{weak}* \end{cases}$$

Note that, thanks to (12), the uniqueness of the limits $\mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(i)} = \mathbf{u}$, for each $i = 0, 1, 2$ hold.

Moreover, from (11)

$$u_{3,k,h}^{(0)} \to u_3 \quad \text{in } L^2(H_0(\partial_z)).$$

Finally, $(S)_h^{m+1}$ can be rewritten (eliminating the pressure) as follows:

$$\Big(\partial_t \mathbf{u}_{k,h}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) + c\Big(\mathbf{U}_{k,h}^{(0)}, \mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(1)}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) + \Big(\nabla \mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(2)}, \nabla \mathbf{v}_h\Big) = \Big(\mathbf{f}^{m+1}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) + \Big(\mathbf{g}_s^{m+1}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big)_{\Gamma_s} \tag{13}$$

for each $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{X}_h \cap \mathbf{V}$.

On the other hand, $(S_0)_h^m$ is rewritten as

$$\Big(\partial_z u_{3,k,h}^{(0)}, \partial_z w_h\Big) = -\Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(0)}, \partial_z w_h\Big) \quad \forall\, w_h \in Y_h \tag{14}$$

To take limits in (13), we need for instance compactness of $(\mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(1)})_{k,h}$ in $L^2(\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega))$. But, owing to (12), it suffices to obtain compactness of $(\mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(2)})_{k,h}$ in $L^2(\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega))$. Assuming this compactness, taking (13)-(14) in (k', h'), the pass to the limit when $(k', h') \to 0$ can be realized by a standard way, concluding that $(\mathbf{u}, u_3)$ is a weak solution of the continuous problem (R).

Therefore, it suffices to get compactness of $(\mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(2)})_{k,h}$ in $L^2(\mathbf{L}^2(\Omega))$. For this, let us introduce

$$\mathbf{V}_h = \{\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{X}_h \ / \ \Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{v}_h \rangle, q_h\Big)_S = 0,\ \forall q_h \in Q_h\}$$

and the operator $A_h^{-1} : \mathbf{V}_h \to \mathbf{V}_h$ defined as the inverse of the discrete "hydrostatic" Stokes problem: given $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h$,

$$A_h^{-1}\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h \text{ such that } \Big(\nabla\, A_h^{-1}\mathbf{u}_h, \nabla \mathbf{v}_h\Big) = \Big(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) \quad \forall\, \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h \tag{15}$$

Taking $\mathbf{v}_h = A_h^{-1}\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h$ in (15),

$$|\nabla\, A_h^{-1}\mathbf{u}_h|^2 = \Big(\mathbf{u}_h, A_h^{-1}\mathbf{u}_h\Big) \le C\, \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{V_h'}\, |\nabla A_h^{-1}\mathbf{u}_h|, \quad \forall\, \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h \tag{16}$$

hence

$$|\nabla A_h^{-1}\mathbf{u}_h| \le C\, \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{V_h'}.$$

To obtain the inverse bound, we take any $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h$ in (15), then

$$\Big(\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) = \Big(\nabla A_h^{-1}\mathbf{u}_h, \nabla \mathbf{v}_h\Big) \le |\nabla A_h^{-1}\mathbf{u}_h|\, |\nabla \mathbf{v}_h| \qquad \forall \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h,$$

hence

$$\|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{V_h'} \le |\nabla\, A_h^{-1}\, \mathbf{u}_h|.$$

Now, to obtain compactness of $\mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(2)}$ we follow an argument of [23]. First of all, we prove the following result.

Lemma 4 *Under hypothesis of Theorem 3, one has*

$$\int_0^{T-\delta} \|\mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(2)}(t+\delta) - \mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(2)}(t)\|_{V_h'}^2\, dt \le C\, \delta, \quad \forall\, \delta : 0 < \delta < T, \tag{17}$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of k, h and δ.

Proof. Since $\mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(2)}$ is a piecewise constant function, it suffices to suppose that δ is proportional to time step k, i.e., $\delta = r\,k$ for any $r = 1, ..., M$. In fact, to obtain (17), it suffices to prove

$$k \sum_{n=0}^{M-r} \|\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n\|_{V_h'}^2 \leq C(r\,k), \quad \forall\, r = 1, \ldots, M. \tag{18}$$

Taking $k\mathbf{v}_h$, for any $\mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h$, as test functions in $(S_1)_h^{m+1}$ and adding from $m = n$ to $n + r - 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Big(\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) &= -k \sum_{m=n}^{n+r-1} c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^m, \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) - k \sum_{m=n}^{n+r-1} \Big(\nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}, \nabla \mathbf{v}_h\Big) \\ &+ k \sum_{m=n}^{n+r-1} \left\{ \Big(p_h^{m+1}, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{v}_h \rangle\Big)_S + \Big\langle \mathbf{f}^{m+1}, \mathbf{v}_h \Big\rangle_\Omega + \Big\langle \mathbf{g}_s^m, \mathbf{v}_h \Big\rangle_{\Gamma_s} \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Now, taking $\mathbf{v}_h = kA_h^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n)$ as test function in (19), using (16) and adding from $n = 0$ to $M - r$,

$$\begin{aligned} k \sum_{n=0}^{M-r} \|\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n\|_{V_h'}^2 &= -k^2 \sum_{n=0}^{M-r} \sum_{m=n}^{n+r-1} c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^m, \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}, A_h^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n)\Big) \\ &- k^2 \sum_{n=0}^{M-r} \sum_{m=n}^{n+r-1} \Big(\nabla \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}, \nabla\, A_h^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n)\Big) \\ &+ k^2 \sum_{m=n}^{n+r-1} \left\{ \Big\langle \mathbf{f}^{m+1}, A_h^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n) \Big\rangle_\Omega + \Big\langle \mathbf{g}_s^{m+1}, A_h^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n) \Big\rangle_{\Gamma_s} \right\} \\ &:= J_1 + J_2 + J_3. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we have to bound the J_i terms. The bound of J_3 is rather standard. Since J_2 is easier to bound than J_1, we only analyze the more complicate term of J_1, which is the vertical convection:

$$\begin{aligned} c\Big(u_{3,h}^m, \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}, A_h^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n)\Big) &= -\frac{1}{2}\Big(\partial_z u_{3,h}^m\, \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}, A_h^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n)\Big) \\ &- \Big(u_{3,h}^m\, \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}, \partial_z A_h^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n)\Big) = I_1 + I_2 \end{aligned}$$

Since bound I_1 is easier than I_2 (in fact, the I_1 term is the classical isotropic term appearing in the Navier-Stokes framework, see [24]), we only bound I_2 using inequality (6) as follows:

$$I_2 \leq \|u_{3,h}^m\|_{L_z^\infty L_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \|\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{L_z^2 L_{\mathbf{x}}^6} \|\partial_z A_h^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n)\|_{L_z^2 L_{\mathbf{x}}^3} \leq C\, \|\mathbf{u}_h^m\|\, \|\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}\|\, \|A_h^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n)\|_{W^{1,3}}$$

To bound the term $\|A_h^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n)\|_{W^{1,3}}$, we are going to use the following Lemma (see Appendix for a proof):

Lemma 5 *Assuming* **(H0)** *and the inverse inequality* $\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{W^{1,6}} \leq C\frac{1}{h}\|\mathbf{v}_h\|$ *given in* **(H2)**, *then*

$$\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h\|_{W^{1,6}} \leq C\,|\mathbf{v}_h|, \quad \forall\, \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h.$$

In particular, $\|A^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n)\|_{W^{1,3}} \leq C|\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n|$ hence the following bound holds:

$$J_1 \leq C\,k^2 \sum_{n=0}^{M-r} \sum_{m=n}^{n+r-1} \|\mathbf{u}_h^m\|\, \|\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}\|\, |\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n|$$

Then, applying Fubini's discrete rule, we obtain

$$J_1 \leq C\, k^2 \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \|\mathbf{u}_h^m\|\, \|\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}\| \sum_{n=\overline{m-r+1}}^{\overline{m}} |\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n|$$

where

$$\overline{m} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m < 0, \\ m & \text{if } 0 \leq m \leq M-r, \\ M-r & \text{if } m > M-r. \end{cases}$$

Since $|\overline{m} - \overline{m-r+1}| \leq r$, then $\sum_{n=\overline{m-r+1}}^{\overline{m}} |\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n| \leq C\, r$. Finally, since $k \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \|\mathbf{u}_h^m\|\, \|\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}\| \leq C$, one arrives at $J_1 \leq C\,(r\,k)$. On the other hand, one also has $J_2 + J_3 \leq C\,(r\,k)$ and the proof of Lemma 4 is finished. ∎

Note that the bound for the fractional derivative in time (17) has been obtained in the norm $\mathbf{V}_h'$ which moves with respect to the space parameter h. But, the compactness results (see for instance J. Simon [33]) does not work in these conditions. Then, we will use the already cited argument of [23] in order to find a fixed norm where the time fractional derivative can be bounded. For this, we consider the orthogonal projector onto $\mathbf{V}$:

$$R_h : \mathbf{V}_h \to \mathbf{V} \text{ defined as } \Big(\nabla(R_h\mathbf{v}_h - \mathbf{v}_h), \nabla\mathbf{w}\Big) = 0, \quad \forall\, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{V},$$

which has the following properties (arguing as in [23]):

$$\|R_h\mathbf{u}_h\|_{H^1} \leq \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{H^1} \quad (H^1\text{-stability}),$$

$$|R_h\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{u}_h| \leq C\, h \|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{u}_h \rangle\|_{L^2(S)} \quad (L^2\text{-error estimate}),$$

and

$$\|R_h\mathbf{u}_h\|_{V'} \leq \|\mathbf{u}_h\|_{V_h'} + C\, h.$$

For the second estimate, the H^2 regularity of the hydrostatic Stokes problem with second member $R_h\mathbf{u}_h - \mathbf{u}_h$ must be used, and for the last estimate, it uses the orthogonal projector onto $\mathbf{V}_h$ $P_h : \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{V}_h$ defined as $\Big(P_h\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) = 0,\ \forall\, \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{V}_h$ (see [23] for more details).

From here, using (18), one has

$$k \sum_{n=0}^{M-r} \|R_h(\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n)\|_{V'}^2 \leq C\, k \sum_{n=0}^{M-r} \|\mathbf{u}_h^{n+r} - \mathbf{u}_h^n\|_{V_h'}^2 + C\, h \leq C(r\,k + h).$$

The above inequality can be written as

$$\int_0^{T-\delta} \|R_h\, \mathbf{u}_{h,k}^{(2)}(t+\delta) - R_h\, \mathbf{u}_{h,k}^{(2)}(t)\|_{V'}^2\, dt \leq C\,(\delta + h).$$

Now, we can apply a compactness (by perturbations) result due to P. Azérad and F. Guillén [2], obtaining that $R_h\mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(2)} \to \mathbf{u}$ in $L^2(0,T;\mathbf{L}^2)$-strong. From here, arguing again as in [23], one can deduce $\mathbf{u}_{k,h}^{(2)} \to \mathbf{u}$ in $L^2(0,T;\mathbf{L}^2)$-strong, and the proof of Theorem 3 is finished. ∎

4 Error estimates with respect to problem (R)

In this section, we will obtain optimal error estimates (for the velocity and pressure) with respect to a sufficiently regular solution $\{\mathbf{u}, u_3, p_s\}$ of problem (R).

In order to obtain these error estimates, the following constraint between the time step k and the mesh size h will be assumed:

$$(\mathbf{H}) \qquad k \leq h^2.$$

4.1 Regularity hypotheses

The following regularity hypotheses for the solution $(\mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{u}, u_3), p_s)$ of (R) will be imposed:

- To obtain order $O(\sqrt{k} + h^l)$ in $l^\infty(\mathbf{L}^2) \cap l^2(\mathbf{H}^1)$ for both velocities:

  $$(\mathbf{R1}) \quad \mathbf{U} \in L^\infty(\mathbf{H}^{l+1}), \quad \mathbf{u}_t \in L^2(\mathbf{H}^l), \quad \mathbf{U}_t \in L^2(\mathbf{L}^2), \quad p_s \in L^2(H^l), \ \sqrt{t}\,\mathbf{u}_{tt} \in L^2(\mathbf{H}_{b,l}^{-1}).$$

- To obtain order $O(k + h^l)$ in $l^\infty(\mathbf{L}^2) \cap l^2(\mathbf{H}^1)$ for the end-of-step velocity:

  $$(\mathbf{R2}) \qquad \mathbf{u}_{tt} \in L^2(\mathbf{V}').$$

- To get order $O(\sqrt{k} + h^l)$ in $l^2(\mathbf{L}^2)$ for the time discrete derivative of end-of-step velocity, in $l^\infty(\mathbf{H}^1)$ for end-of-step velocity and in $l^2(L^2(S))$ for pressure,

  $$(\mathbf{R3}) \qquad \mathbf{U}_t \in L^2(\mathbf{H}^1), \quad \mathbf{u}_{tt} \in L^2(\mathbf{L}^2).$$

- To get order $O(\sqrt{k} + h^2)$ $(l = 2)$ in $l^\infty(\mathbf{L}^2) \cap l^2(\mathbf{H}^1)$ for the time discrete derivative of velocities,

  $$(\mathbf{R4}) \qquad \begin{array}{c} \partial_t p_s \in L^2(H^l),\ \mathbf{U}_t \in L^\infty(\mathbf{L}^3) \cap L^2(\mathbf{H}^{l+1}), \quad \mathbf{u}_t \in L^\infty(\mathbf{H}^2),\ \mathbf{u}_{tt} \in L^2(\mathbf{H}^l), \\ \mathbf{U}_{tt} \in L^2(\mathbf{L}^2),\ \sqrt{t}\mathbf{u}_{ttt} \in L^2(\mathbf{H}_{b,l}^{-1}). \end{array}$$

- To obtain order $O(k + h^2)$ $(l = 2)$ in $l^\infty(\mathbf{L}^2) \cap l^2(\mathbf{H}^1)$ for the time discrete derivative of end-of-step velocity and in $l^2(L^2(S))$ for the pressure,

  $$(\mathbf{R5}) \qquad \mathbf{U}_t \in L^\infty(\mathbf{H}^1), \quad \mathbf{u}_{ttt} \in L^2(\mathbf{V}').$$

4.2 Problems related to the spatial errors

We will present an error analysis for the fully discrete scheme $(\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}, \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}, p_h^{m+1})$ as an approximation of $(\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), p(t_{m+1}))$. Consequently, we consider the following errors:

$$\mathbf{e}^{m+1/2} = \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}) - \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}, \qquad \mathbf{e}^{m+1} = \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}) - \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}, \qquad e_p^{m+1} = p_s(t_{m+1}) - p_h^{m+1},$$

$$e_3^{m+1} = u_3(t_{m+1}) - u_{3,h}^{m+1}, \qquad \mathbf{E}^{m+1} = (\mathbf{e}^{m+1}, e_3^{m+1}).$$

These errors can be decomposed as follows (splitting interpolation and discrete parts):

$$\mathbf{e}^{m+1/2} = \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1} + \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \qquad \mathbf{e}^{m+1} = \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1} + \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}, \qquad e_p^{m+1} = e_{p,i}^{m+1} + e_{p,h}^{m+1},$$

$$e_3^{m+1} = e_{3,i}^{m+1} + e_{3,h}^{m+1}, \qquad \mathbf{E}^{m+1} = \mathbf{E}_h^{m+1} + \mathbf{E}_i^{m+1}.$$

Concretely

$$\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1} = \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}) - I_h\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} = I_h\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}) - \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1},$$

$$\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} = I_h\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}) - \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2},$$

$$e_{p,i}^{m+1} = p(t_{m+1}) - J_h p(t_{m+1}) \quad \text{and} \quad e_{p,h}^{m+1} = J_h p(t_{m+1}) - p_h^{m+1},$$

$$u_{3,i}^{m+1} = u_3(t_{m+1}) - K_h u_3(t_{m+1}) \quad \text{and} \quad e_{3,h}^{m+1} = K_h u_3(t_{m+1}) - u_{3,h}^{m+1},$$

$$\mathbf{E}_i^{m+1} = (\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, e_{3,i}^{m+1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{E}_h^{m+1} = (\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}, e_{3,h}^{m+1}).$$

Using the following Taylor expansion with integral rest of a function $\phi = \phi(t)$:

$$\phi(t+k) - \phi(t) = \phi'(t+k)\,k - \int_t^{t+k} (s-t)\phi''(s)\,ds,$$

and the variational problem verified for an exact solution $(\mathbf{U}, p_s)$ at $t = t_{m+1}$ of (R), one has:
$(R)^{m+1}$

$$\begin{cases} \Big(\frac{1}{k}(\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}) - \mathbf{u}(t_m)), \mathbf{v}\Big) + c\Big(\mathbf{U}(t_m), \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), \mathbf{v}\Big) + \Big(\nabla\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), \nabla\mathbf{v}\Big) \\ -\Big(p_s(t_{m+1}), \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle\mathbf{v}\rangle\Big)_S = \Big\langle \mathbf{f}(t_{m+1}), \mathbf{v}\Big\rangle_\Omega + \Big\langle \mathbf{g}_s(t_{m+1}), \mathbf{v}\Big\rangle_{\Gamma_s} + \Big(\mathcal{E}^{m+1}, \mathbf{v}\Big), \quad \forall\, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{W}_{b,l}^{1,3} \cap \mathbf{L}^\infty, \\ \Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})\rangle, q\Big)_S = 0, \quad \forall\, q \in L_0^2(S), \\ \Big(\partial_z\, u_3(t_{m+1}), \partial_z v_3\Big) = -\Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), \partial_z v_3\Big), \quad \forall\, v_3 \in H_0(\partial_z), \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{E}^{m+1} := -\dfrac{1}{k}\displaystyle\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} (t - t_m)\,\mathbf{u}_{tt}(t)\,dt - \left(\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathbf{U}_t \cdot \nabla\right)\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})$ is the consistency error.

For simplicity, we assume $\mathbf{f} \in C([0,T]; \mathbf{H}_{b,l}^{-1})$ and $\mathbf{g}_s \in C([0,T]; \mathbf{H}^{-1/2}(\Gamma_s))$ and we choose

$$\mathbf{f}^{m+1} = \mathbf{f}(t_{m+1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{g}_s^{m+1} = \mathbf{g}_s(t_{m+1}).$$

Then, the data errors $\mathbf{f}(t_{m+1}) - \mathbf{f}^{m+1}$ and $\mathbf{g}_s(t_{m+1}) - \mathbf{g}_s^{m+1}$ vanish.

Comparing $(R)^{m+1}$ with $(S_0)_h^m$ and $(S_1)_h^{m+1}$, the following variational problems for the spatial errors $e_{3,h}^m$ and $\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}$ hold:

$$(E_0)_h^m \qquad \Big(\partial_z e_{3,h}^m, \partial_z y_h\Big) = -\Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (\mathbf{e}_h^m + \mathbf{e}_i^m), \partial_z y_h\Big) \quad \forall y_h \in Y_h,$$

$$(E_1)_h^{m+1} \quad \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{k}\Big(\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \mathbf{e}_h^m, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) + \Big(\nabla\, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \nabla\, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) - \Big(p_s(t_{m+1}), \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle\mathbf{v}_h\rangle\Big)_S \\ = \mathbf{NL}^{m+1}(\mathbf{v}_h) + \Big(\mathcal{E}^{m+1}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) - \Big(\delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) - \Big(\nabla \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \nabla \mathbf{v}_h\Big), \quad \forall\, \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{X}_h, \end{cases}$$

where $\delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1} = \dfrac{1}{k}\Big(\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1} - \mathbf{e}_i^m\Big)$ and

$$\mathbf{NL}^{m+1}(\mathbf{v}_h) = -c\Big(\mathbf{E}_h^m + \mathbf{E}_i^m, \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), \mathbf{v}_h\Big) - c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^m, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} + \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big).$$

On the other hand, adding and substrating $I_h\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})$ to $(S_2)_h^{m+1}$ one has

$$(E_2)_h^{m+1} \quad \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{k}\Big(\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} - \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) + \Big(\nabla(\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} - \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}), \nabla \mathbf{v}_h\Big) = -\Big(p_h^{m+1}, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle\mathbf{v}_h\rangle\Big)_S \\ \Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\rangle, q_h\Big)_S = 0, \end{cases}$$

for each $(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \in \mathbf{X}_h \times Q_h$.

Due to the choice of the projector K_h, $\Big(\partial_z e_{3,i}^{m+1}, \partial_z y_h\Big) = 0$, hence it is not appear in $(E_0)_h^{m+1}$. Since the same discrete space for $\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}$ and $\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1}$ has been chosen, the interpolation error depending on $\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \mathbf{e}_h^m$ in $(E_1)_h^{m+1}$ is $\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1} - \mathbf{e}_i^m$ and the interpolation error depending on $\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} - \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}$ in $(E_2)_h^{m+1}$ is zero. Finally, since $\Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle I_h \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})\rangle, q_h\Big)_S = 0$, the corresponding interpolation error $\Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}\rangle, q_h\Big)_S = 0$, hence it is not appear in $(E_2)_h^{m+1}$.

Therefore, adding $(E_1)_h^{m+1}$ and $(E_2)_h^{m+1}$, one arrives at:

$$(E)_h^{m+1} \qquad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \dfrac{1}{k}\Big(\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} - \mathbf{e}_h^m, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) + \Big(\nabla \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}, \nabla \mathbf{v}_h\Big) - \Big(e_{p,h}^{m+1}, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{v}_h\rangle\Big)_S \\ \quad = -\dfrac{1}{k}\Big(\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1} - \mathbf{e}_i^m, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) + \mathbf{NL}^{m+1}(\mathbf{v}_h) + \Big(\mathcal{E}^{m+1}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big), \\ \Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\rangle, q_h\Big)_S = 0. \end{array} \right.$$

Due to the choice of the interpolation operator (I_h, J_h) related to the hydrostatic Stokes problem, the interpolation error $\Big(\nabla \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \nabla \mathbf{v}_h\Big) + \Big(e_{p,i}^{m+1}, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{v}_h\rangle\Big)_S = 0$, hence it does not appear in $(E)_h^{m+1}$.

4.3 Estimates for the vertical velocity

From $(E_0)_h^m$, the following estimate holds:

$$|\partial_z e_{3,h}^m| \leq C(|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{e}_h^m| + |\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{e}_i^m|). \tag{20}$$

Therefore, by using inequality (6),

$$\|e_{3,h}^m\|_{L_z^\infty L_{\mathbf{x}}^2}^2 \leq C(\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\| + \|\mathbf{e}_i^m\|). \tag{21}$$

On the other hand, the approximation property (7) and the regularity $u_3 \in L^\infty(0,T; H^{l+1})$ imply:

$$|\partial_z e_{3,i}^m| \leq C\, h^l\, \|u_3(t_m)\|_{H^{l+1}} \leq C\, h^l. \tag{22}$$

Therefore, by using again (6),

$$\|e_{3,i}^m\|_{L_z^\infty L_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \leq C\, h^l. \tag{23}$$

4.4 $O(\sqrt{k} + h^l)$ error estimates for both velocities in $l^\infty(\mathbf{L}^2) \cap l^2(\mathbf{H}^1)$

Theorem 6 *We assume* **(H0)-(H3)**, **(R1)** *and* $|\mathbf{e}_h^0| \leq C\, h^l$. *Then, there exists* $k_0 > 0$ *such that for any* $k \leq k_0$, *the following error estimates hold*

$$\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{l^\infty(\mathbf{L}^2)\cap l^2(\mathbf{H}^1)} + \|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{l^\infty(\mathbf{L}^2)\cap l^2(\mathbf{H}^1)} \leq C\,(\sqrt{k} + h^l), \tag{24}$$

$$\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \mathbf{e}_h^m\|_{l^2(\mathbf{L}^2)} + \|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} - \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{l^2(\mathbf{L}^2)} \leq C\,\sqrt{k}(\sqrt{k} + h^l). \tag{25}$$

Notice that in this result, the constraint $(\mathbf{H})$ on parameters (k,h) is not necessary although k small enough must be imposed.

Proof. The main idea is to make $2\,k \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \Big\{\Big((E_1)_h^{m+1}, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) + \Big((E_2)_h^{m+1}, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)\Big\}$.

In fact, making $2\,k\,\Big((E_1)_h^{m+1},\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big)$ and taking into account that $c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^m,\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2},\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big)=0$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2-|\mathbf{e}_h^m|^2+|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}-\mathbf{e}_h^m|^2+2\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2\\
=\;& 2\,k\,\Big(p_s(t_{m+1}),\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big)+2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{E}_h^m+\mathbf{E}_i^m,\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}),\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) \qquad (26)\\
+\;& 2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^m,\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1},\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big)+2\,k\,\Big(\mathcal{E}^{m+1}-\delta_t\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1},\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big)-\Big(\nabla\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1},\nabla\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big):=\sum_{i=1}^{5}I_1
\end{aligned}$$

For brevity, we only bound the more difficult terms of the RHS of (26) (for more details, see [25], where these type of bounds have been made for the Navier Stokes case). We bound term I_1, by using that $\Big(J_h p_s(t_{m+1}),\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\mathbf{e}_h^m\Big)=0$, as

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= 2\,k\,\Big(p_s(t_{m+1}),\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot(\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}-\mathbf{e}_h^m)\Big)+2\,k\,\Big(e_{p,i}^{m+1},\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\mathbf{e}_h^m\Big)\\
&= -2\,k\,\Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}p_s(t_{m+1}),\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}-\mathbf{e}_h^m\Big)+2\,k\,\Big(e_{p,i}^{m+1},\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\mathbf{e}_h^m\Big)\\
&\le \varepsilon|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}-\mathbf{e}_h^m|^2+C\,k^2\|p_s(t_{m+1})\|^2+\varepsilon\,k\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2+C\,k\,h^{2l}\|p_s(t_{m+1})\|^2_{H^l(S)}
\end{aligned}$$

The interpolation part of I_4 is

$$2\,k\,\Big(\delta_t\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1},\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big)=2\,k\,\Big(\mathbf{e}_i(\delta_t\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})),\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big)\le\varepsilon\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2+C\,h^{2l}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}}\|\mathbf{u}_t\|^2_{H^l}$$

The discrete vertical part of I_2 is

$$2\,k\,c\Big(e_{3,h}^m,\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}),\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big)=2\,k\,\Big(e_{3,h}^m\,\partial_z\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}),\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big)+k\,\Big(\partial_z e_{3,h}^m\,\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}),\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big):=L_1+L_2.$$

By using that $\mathbf{u}\in L^\infty(\mathbf{H}^{l+1})$ and (21),

$$\begin{aligned}
L_1 &\le 2\,k\,\|e_{3,h}^m\|_{L_z^\infty L_{\mathbf{x}}^2}\|\partial_z\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})\|_{L_z^2L_{\mathbf{x}}^4}\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{L_z^2L_{\mathbf{x}}^4}\\
&\le C\,k\,(\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|+\|\mathbf{e}_i^m\|)|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^{1/2}\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^{1/2}\\
&\le \varepsilon\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2+C\,k\,h^{2l}+\varepsilon\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2+C\,k\,|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2
\end{aligned}$$

By using that $\mathbf{u}\in L^\infty(\mathbf{H}^2)$ and (20),

$$\begin{aligned}
L_2 &\le k\,|\partial_z e_{3,h}^m|\,\|\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})\|_{L^\infty}\,|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|\le\varepsilon\,k\,(\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2+\|\mathbf{e}_i^m\|^2)+C\,k\,|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2\\
&\le \varepsilon\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2+C\,k\,|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2+C\,k\,h^{2l}.
\end{aligned}$$

By a similar way, by using that $\mathbf{u}\in L^\infty(\mathbf{H}^2)$, $u_3\in L^\infty(\mathbf{H}^{l+1})$ and (22), the vertical interpolation part of I_2 is bounded as:

$$\begin{aligned}
2\,k\,c\Big(e_{3,i}^m,\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}),\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) &= 2\,k\Big(e_{3,i}^m\,\partial_z\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}),\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big)+k\,\Big(\partial_z e_{3,i}^m\,\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}),\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big)\\
&\le C\,k\,\|e_{3,i}^m\|_{H(\partial_z)}\,\|\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})\|_{H^2}\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|\le\varepsilon\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2+C\,k\,h^{2l}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we decompose I_3 as

$$I_3=2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^m,\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1},\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big)=2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{E}^m,\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1},\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big)-2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{U}(t_m),\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1},\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big),$$

and their more difficult terms can be bounded, using (20), (21) and the inverse inequalities $\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{L_z^2 L_{\mathbf{x}}^\infty} \leq C\, h^{-1}|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|$ and $\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{L^3} \leq C\, h^{-1/2}|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|$, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
2\,k\,c\Big(e_{3,h}^m + e_{3,i}^m, \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) &= 2\,k\Big((e_{3,h}^m + e_{3,i}^m)\,\partial_z \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) \\
&+ k\Big((\partial_z e_{3,h}^m + \partial_z e_{3,i}^m)\,\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) \\
&\leq 2\,k\|e_{3,h}^m + e_{3,i}^m\|_{L_z^\infty L_{\mathbf{x}}^2}\|\partial_z \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}\|_{L_z^2 L_{\mathbf{x}}^2}\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{L_z^2 L_{\mathbf{x}}^\infty} \\
&+ k\|\partial_z\, e_{3,h}^m + \partial_z e_{3,i}^m\|_{L^2}\|\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}\|_{L^6}\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{L^3} \\
&\leq C\,k\,(\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\| + \|\mathbf{e}_i^m\| + h^l)\|\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}\|\,(h^{-1} + h^{-1/2})|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}| \\
&\leq C\,k\,(\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\| + h^l)h^l\,h^{-1}|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}| \\
&\leq \varepsilon\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2 + C\,k\,h^{2l} + C\,k\,|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$2\,k\,c\Big(u_3(t_m), \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) \leq \varepsilon\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2 + C\,k\,h^{2l}.$$

Therefore, applying previous estimates to (26) and making $|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2 \leq 2(|\mathbf{e}_h^m|^2 + |\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \mathbf{e}_h^m|^2)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2 - |\mathbf{e}_h^m|^2 + |\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \mathbf{e}_h^m|^2 + 2\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2 \\
&\leq C\,k(|\mathbf{e}_h^m|^2 + |\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \mathbf{e}_h^m|^2) + 2\,k\,\Big(\mathcal{E}^{m+1}, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) + \varepsilon\,k\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2 \\
&+\varepsilon\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2 + C\,k^2 + C\,k\,h^{2l}.
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

On the other hand, making $2\,k\Big((E_2)_h^{m+1}, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)$, we arrive at

$$|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2 - |\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2 + |\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} - \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2 + k\left\{\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} - \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2\right\} = 0. \tag{28}$$

Adding (27) and (28) from $m = 0$ to r (with any $r < M$) and choosing ε and k small enough,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbf{e}_h^{r+1}|^2 + \sum_{m=0}^{r}\left(|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} - \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \mathbf{e}_h^m|^2\right) \\
&\quad + k\sum_{m=0}^{r}\left(\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} - \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2\right) \\
&\leq C\,k\sum_{m=0}^{r}|\mathbf{e}_h^m|^2 + \varepsilon\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^0\|^2 + C(k + h^{2l})
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, applying discrete Gronwall's Lemma, we can get (24) and (25). ∎

4.5 $O(k + h^l)$ error estimates for $\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}$ in $l^\infty(\mathbf{L}^2) \cap l^2(\mathbf{H}^1)$.

Theorem 7 *Under hypotheses of Theorem 6,* (**R2**) *and* (**H**), *the following error estimate holds*

$$\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{l^\infty(\mathbf{L}^2)\cap l^2(\mathbf{H}^1)} \leq C\,(k + h^l). \tag{29}$$

Note that, from (20) and (29), we also have

$$\|e_{3,h}^{m+1}\|_{l^2(H(\partial_z))} \le C\,(k+h^l).$$

Proof. The main idea is to make $2\,k\sum_{m=0}^{M-1}\Big((E)_h^{m+1},\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)$.

In fact, making $2\,k\,\Big((E)_h^{m+1},\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)$, the pressure term vanish, and we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2-|\mathbf{e}_h^m|^2+|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}-\mathbf{e}_h^m|^2+2\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|^2\\
=\;& -2\,k\Big(\delta_t\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1},\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)-2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{E}_h^m,\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}),\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)-2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{E}_i^m,\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}),\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)\\
-\;& 2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^m,\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2},\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)-2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^m,\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1},\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)+2\,k\Big(\mathcal{E}^{m+1},\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big):=\sum_{i=1}^{6}I_i
\end{aligned}$$

We bound the I_i terms of similar way as in Theorem 6:

$$I_1=-2\,k\Big(\mathbf{e}_i(\delta_t\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})),\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)\le\varepsilon\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|^2+C\,h^{2l}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}}\|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^l}^2.$$

The vertical part of I_5 is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
2\,k\,c\Big(e_{3,h}^m,\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1},\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) &\le C\,\|e_{3,h}^m\|_{L_z^\infty L_{\mathbf{x}}^2}\|\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}\|_{H^1}\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{L_z^2L_{\mathbf{x}}^\infty}\le C\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|\,h\,h^{-1}|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|\\
&\le \varepsilon\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2+C\,k(|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}-\mathbf{e}_h^m|^2+|\mathbf{e}_h^m|^2).
\end{aligned}$$

The term $I_4=c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^m,\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2},\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)\neq 0$, but using that $c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^m,\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1},\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)=0$, this term I_4 is decomposed as

$$I_4=-2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{E}^m,\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}-\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1},\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)+2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{U}(t_m),\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}-\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1},\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big):=J_1+J_2.$$

The more complicate terms of J_1 are the vertical parts:

$$2\,k\Big((e_{3,h}^m+e_{3,i}^m)\,(\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}-\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}),\partial_z\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)+2\,k\Big(\partial_z(e_{3,h}^m+e_{3,i}^m)\,(\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}-\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}),\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big):=J_{1,1}+J_{1,2}.$$

Since $J_{1,2}$ is easier to bound than $J_{1,1}$, we only bound $J_{1,1}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{1,1} &\le 2\,k\,\|e_{3,h}^m+e_{3,i}^m\|_{L_z^\infty L_{\mathbf{x}}^2}\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}-\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{L_z^2L_{\mathbf{x}}^\infty}\|\partial_z\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{L_z^2L_{\mathbf{x}}^2}\\
&\le C\,k\,(\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|+\|\mathbf{e}_i^m\|+h^l\,\|u_3(t_m)\|_{H^{l+1}})\,h^{-1}|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}-\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|\\
&\le C\,k\,(h^{-2}\,|\mathbf{e}_h^m|+1)\,|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}-\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|\\
&\le \varepsilon\;k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|^2+C\,k\,h^{-4}|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}-\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2\,|\mathbf{e}_h^m|^2+C\,k\,|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}-\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used (21) and (23) and the inverse inequalities

$$\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}-\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{L_z^2\,L_{\mathbf{x}}^\infty}\le C\,h^{-1}|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}-\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|\quad\text{and}\quad\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|\le C\,h^{-1}|\mathbf{e}_h^m|.$$

Moreover, J_2 can be bounded as

$$J_2\le\varepsilon\;k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|^2+C\,k\,|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}-\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2.$$

Finally, adding from $m=0$ to r (with any $r<M$) and taking into account the bound

$$C\,k\,h^{-4}\sum_m|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}-\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2\le C\,h^{-2}(k+h^{2l})\le C,$$

(where estimate (25) of Theorem 6 and (**H**) have been used) we can apply the discrete Gronwall's Lemma, obtaining the desired estimates. ∎

4.6 $O(\sqrt{k}+h^l)$ error estimates for $\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}$ in $l^2(\mathbf{L}^2)$ and for $\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}$ in $l^\infty(\mathbf{H}^1)$

We will use the following notations for the discrete derivative of errors

$$\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} := \frac{\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}-\mathbf{e}_h^m}{k}, \qquad \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} := \frac{\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}-\mathbf{e}_h^{m-1/2}}{k}.$$

Theorem 8 *Assume hypotheses of Theorem 6,* (**R3**), (**H**) *and* $\|\mathbf{e}_h^0\| \le C\,h^l$. *Then, the following error estimate holds*

$$\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{l^\infty(\mathbf{H}^1)} + \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{l^2(\mathbf{L}^2)} \le C\,(\sqrt{k}+h^l).$$

Proof. Making $2\,k\Big((E)_h^{m+1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)$ the pressure term vanish, and we arrive at

$$\begin{array}{c} \|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2 + \|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}-\mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2 + 2\,k\,|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2 = -2\,k\Big(\delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) \\ -2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{E}_h^m, \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) - 2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{E}_i^m, \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) \\ -2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^m, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) - 2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^m, \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1/2}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) + 2\,k\Big(\mathcal{E}^{m+1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) \\ := \sum_{i=1}^6 I_i \end{array} \tag{30}$$

We must bound the I_i terms:

$$I_1 = -2\,k\Big(\mathbf{e}_i(\delta_t \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})), \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) \le \varepsilon\,k\,|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2 + C\,h^{2l}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^l}^2.$$

Now, the term $I_4 = -2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^m, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)$ does not vanish,

$$I_4 = 2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{E}^m, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) - 2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{U}(t_m), \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) := J_1 + J_2.$$

The more complicate terms to bound are the vertical parts of J_1:

$$2\,k\Big((e_{3,h}^m + e_{3,i}^m)\,\partial_z \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) + k\Big(\partial_z(e_{3,h}^m + e_{3,i}^m)\,\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) := J_{1,1} + J_{1,2}.$$

By using (21) and (23) and the inverse inequality $\|\partial_z \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{L_z^2 L_{\mathbf{x}}^\infty} \le C\,h^{-1}\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|$,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} J_{1,1} & \le & 2\,k\,\|e_{3,h}^m + e_{3,i}^m\|_{L_z^\infty L_{\mathbf{x}}^2}\|\partial_z \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{L_z^2 L_{\mathbf{x}}^\infty}\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{L_z^2 L_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \\ & \le & C\,k\,(\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\| + h^l\|\mathbf{u}(t_m)\|_{H^{l+1}} + h^l\|u_3(t_m)\|_{H^{l+1}})\,h^{-1}\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|\,|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}| \\ & \le & \varepsilon\,k\,|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2 + C\,k\,h^{-2}\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2 + C\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2. \end{array}$$

By using the inverse inequality $\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{L^\infty} \le C\,h^{-1/2}\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|$,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} J_{1,2} & \le & k\,\|\partial_z(e_{3,h}^m + e_{3,i}^m)\|_{L^2}\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{L^\infty}\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{L^2} \le k\,(\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\| + h^l)\,h^{-1/2}\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|\,|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}| \\ & \le & \varepsilon\,k\,|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2 + C\,k\,h^{-1}\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2 + C\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2. \end{array}$$

The J_2-term is bounded as

$$J_2 \le C\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|\,|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}| \le \varepsilon\,k\,|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2 + C\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2.$$

On the other hand, the vertical part of I_2 and I_3 are bounded as

$$I_2 \leq C\,k\Big(\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\| + h^l\Big)\|\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})\|_{H^3}|\delta_t\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}| \leq \varepsilon\,k\,|\delta_t\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2 + C\,k\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2 + C\,k\,h^{2l},$$

$$I_3 \leq \|e_{3,i}^m\|_{H(\partial_z)}\,\|\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})\|_{H^3}\,|\delta_t\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}| \leq \varepsilon\,k\,|\delta_t\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2 + C\,k\,h^{2l}.$$

We write I_5 as

$$I_5 = 2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{E}^m, \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \delta_t\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) - 2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{U}(t_m), \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \delta_t\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)$$

and its vertical part as

$$2\,k\Big((e_{3,h}^m + e_{3,i}^m)\partial_z\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \delta_t\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) - k\Big(\partial_z(e_{3,h}^m + e_{3,i}^m)\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \delta_t\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) := K_1 + K_2$$

We bound both terms as

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &\leq 2\,k\,\|e_{3,h}^m + e_{3,i}^m\|_{L_z^\infty L_{\mathbf{x}}^2}\|\partial_z\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}\|_{L_z^2 L_{\mathbf{x}}^2}\|\delta_t\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{L_z^2 L_{\mathbf{x}}^\infty} \\ &\leq C\,k\,(\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\| + \|\mathbf{e}_i^m\| + h^l)\,h^l\|\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})\|_{H^{l+1}}\,h^{-1}\,|\delta_t\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}| \\ &\leq \varepsilon\,k\,|\delta_t\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2 + C\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2 + C\,k\,h^{2l}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} K_2 &\leq k\,\|\partial_z(e_{3,h}^m + e_{3,i}^m)\|_{L^2}\,\|\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1/2}\|_{L^6}\,\|\delta_t\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{L^3} \\ &\leq C\,k\,(\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\| + \|\mathbf{e}_i^m\| + h^l)\,h^l\|\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})\|_{H^{l+1}}\,h^{-1/2}\,|\delta_t\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}| \\ &\leq \varepsilon\,k\,|\delta_t\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2 + C\,k\,h\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2 + C\,k\,h^{2l}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, taking into account the above estimates and adding (30) from $m = 0$ to r (with any $r < M$), since from estimates of Theorem 6 and (**H**),

$$k\,h^{-2}\sum_m \|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2 \leq C\,h^{-2}(k + h^{2l}) \leq C, \quad (l \geq 1),$$

we can apply the discrete Gronwall's Lemma obtaining the desired estimates. ■

4.7 $O(\sqrt{k} + h^l)$ error estimates for $e_{p,h}^{m+1}$ in $l^2(\mathbf{L}^2)$

Corollary 9 *Assuming hypotheses of Theorem 8, one has*

$$\|e_{p,h}^{m+1}\|_{l^2(L^2)} \leq C\,(\sqrt{k} + h^l).$$

The proof is rather standard, starting from estimates of previous Theorems and applying the hydrostatic *Inf-Sup* condition **(H1)**.

It is important to remark that, up this moment, the order obtained is $O(\sqrt{k}+h^l) = O(h+h^l)$ under the constraint $k \leq h^2$, then this order is optimal for $O(h)$ approximation (i.e. $l = 1$). In the next Section, we study an argument to arrive at optimal order $O(k + h^l)$ for the case $l = 2$.

4.8 An alternative way for $O(h^2)$ accuracy ($l = 2$)

4.8.1 $O(\sqrt{k} + h^2)$ error estimates for $\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}$ and $\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}$ in $l^\infty(\mathbf{L}^2) \cap l^2(\mathbf{H}^1)$.

Making $\delta_t(E_1)_h^{m+1}$ and $\delta_t(E_2)_h^{m+1}$ for each $m \geq 1$, one obtains $\forall\, \mathbf{v}_h \in \mathbf{X}_h$:

$$(D_1)_h^{m+1} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{k}\Big(\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) + \Big(\nabla \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \nabla\, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) - \Big(\delta_t p_s(t_{m+1}), \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{v}_h \rangle\Big)_S \\ = \Big(\delta_t \mathcal{E}^{m+1}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) + \delta_t \mathbf{NL}_h^{m+1}(\mathbf{v}_h) - \frac{1}{k}\Big((\delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m}), \mathbf{v}_h\Big) - \Big(\nabla\, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \nabla\, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) \end{array} \right.$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_t \mathbf{NL}_h^{m+1}(\mathbf{v}_h) \;\; = \;\; & -c\Big(\delta_t \mathbf{E}^m, \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), \mathbf{v}_h\Big) - c\Big(\delta_t \mathbf{U}_h^m, \mathbf{e}^{m+1/2}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) \\ & -c\Big(\mathbf{E}^{m-1}, \delta_t \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), \mathbf{v}_h\Big) - c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^{m-1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}^{m+1/2}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) \end{aligned}$$

and, for all $(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \in \mathbf{X}_h \times Q_h$,

$(D_2)_h^{m+1}$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{k}\Big(\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) + \Big(\nabla(\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}), \nabla \mathbf{v}_h\Big) = -\Big(\delta_t p_{s,h}^{m+1}, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{v}_h \rangle\Big)_S \\ \Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} \rangle, q_h\Big)_S = 0. \end{array} \right.$$

Finally, adding $(D_1)_h^{m+1}$ and $(D_2)_h^{m+1}$ we obtain, for all $(\mathbf{v}_h, q_h) \in \mathbf{X}_h \times Q_h$:

$$(D_3)_h^{m+1} \qquad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{k}\Big(\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) + \Big(\nabla\, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}, \nabla\, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) + \Big(\delta_t e_{p,h}^{m+1}, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{v}_h \rangle\Big)_S \\ \qquad = \Big(\delta_t \mathcal{E}^{m+1}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) + \delta_t \mathbf{NL}_h^{m+1}(\mathbf{v}_h) - \frac{1}{k}\Big(\delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m}, \mathbf{v}_h\Big) \\ \Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} \rangle, q_h\Big)_S = 0. \end{array} \right.$$

Theorem 10 *Under hypotheses of Theorem 7 for $l = 2$ (i.e. $O(h^2)$ FE approximation),* (**R4**) *and assuming the following hypothesis for the first step of the scheme*

$$|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^1| \leq C\,(\sqrt{k} + h^2),$$

then there exists $k_1 > 0$ such that for any $k \leq k_1$,

$$\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{l^\infty(\mathbf{L}^2) \cap l^2(\mathbf{H}^1)} + \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{l^\infty(\mathbf{L}^2) \cap l^2(\mathbf{H}^1)} \leq C\,(\sqrt{k} + h^2),$$

$$\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{l^2(\mathbf{L}^2)} + \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m}\|_{l^2(\mathbf{L}^2)} \leq C\,\sqrt{k}\,(\sqrt{k} + h^2).$$

Proof. Since the initial estimate $|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^1| \leq C\,(\sqrt{k} + h^2)$ has been assumed, it suffices to prove the generic estimate for $\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}$ and $\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}$, for each $m \geq 1$.

Taking $2\,k\,\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} \in \mathbf{X}_h$ as test function in $(D_1)_h^{m+1}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & |\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2 - |\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m}|^2 + |\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m}|^2 + 2\;k \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2 \\ & = -2\,k\,\Big(\frac{1}{k}(\delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m}), \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) - 2\,k\,\Big(\nabla\, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \nabla \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) \\ & +2\,k\Big(\delta_t p_s(t_{m+1}), \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} \rangle\Big) + 2\,k\Big(\delta_t \mathcal{E}^{m+1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) + 2\,k \delta_t \mathbf{NL}_h^{m+1}(\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}) \\ & := I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 + I_5. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

We bound the RHS of (31) as in Theorem 6 (recalling that now one has $O(h^2)$ approximation)

$$I_1 \leq \varepsilon\, k\, \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2 + C\, h^4 \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+2}} \|\mathbf{u}_{tt}\|_{H^2}^2$$

$$I_2 \leq \varepsilon\, k\, \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2 + C\, h^4 \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \|\mathbf{u}_{t}\|_{H^3}^2$$

$$I_3 \leq \varepsilon |\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m}|^2 + C\, k^2 \|\delta_t p_s(t_{m+1})\|_{H^1(S)}^2 + \varepsilon\, k \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2 + C\, k\, h^4 \|\delta_t p_s(t_{m+1})\|_{H^2}^2$$

The bound of I_4 depending on the consistency error $\delta_t \mathcal{E}^{m+1}$ is not problematic.

Now, we bound the more complicate terms of I_5, again as in the proof of Theorem 6:

$$2\, k\, c\Big(\delta_t e_{3,h}^m, \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) \leq \varepsilon\, k (\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2 + \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^m\|^2) + \varepsilon\, k\, \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2 + C\, k\, |\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2$$
$$\leq \varepsilon\, k\, \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2 + C\, h^4 \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^3}^2 + \varepsilon\, k\, \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2 + C\, k\, |\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2,$$

$$\begin{aligned} 2\, k\, c\Big(\delta_t e_{3,i}^m, \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) &\leq \varepsilon\, k\, \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2 + C\, k\, \|\delta_t e_{3,i}^m\|_{H(\partial_z)}^2 \\ &\leq \varepsilon\, k\, \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2 + C\, h^4 \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \|\partial_t u_3\|_{H^3}^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$2\, k\, c\Big(\delta_t e_{3,h}^m + \delta_t e_{3,i}^m, \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) \leq \varepsilon\, k \left(\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2 + \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^m\|^2 + \|\delta_t e_{3,i}^m\|_{H(\partial_z)}^2\right) + C\, k\, |\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2$$
$$\leq \varepsilon\, k\, \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2 + C\, h^4 \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} (\|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^3}^2 + \|\partial_t u_3\|_{H^3}^2) + C\, k\, |\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2.$$

The vertical part of $2\, k\, c\Big(\mathbf{E}^{m-1}, \delta_t \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big)$ is decomposed as follows:

$$2\, k \left(e_{3,h}^{m-1} + e_{3,i}^{m-1}, \partial_z \delta_t \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\right) + k \left(\partial_z (e_{3,h}^{m-1} + e_{3,i}^{m-1}), \delta_t \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\right) := L_1 + L_2$$

Since L_2 is easier to bound than L_1, we only bound L_1:

$$L_1 \leq \|e_{3,h}^{m-1} + e_{3,i}^{m-1}\|_{L_z^\infty L_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \|\partial_z \delta_t \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})\|_{L_z^2 L_{\mathbf{x}}^4} \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{L_z^2 L_{\mathbf{x}}^4}$$

$$\leq \varepsilon\, k\, \|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2 + C\, k\, h^{2l} + \varepsilon\, k\, \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2 + C\, k\, |\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2.$$

On the other hand, we bound the other terms of I_5 which have not similar terms in the proof of Theorem 6:

$$c\Big(\delta_t \mathbf{U}_h^m, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) = -c\Big(\delta_t \mathbf{E}^m, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) + c\Big(\delta_t \mathbf{U}(t_m), \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big).$$

The second term of the RHS is bounded by $\varepsilon\, k\, \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2 + C\, k\, |\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2$. With respect to the first term on the RHS, the more complicate term to bound is the vertical part:

$$-2\, k\, c\Big(\delta_t e_3^m, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big)$$
$$= -2\, k \Big(\left(\delta_t e_{3,h}^m + \delta_t e_{3,i}^m\right) \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \partial_z \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) + k \Big(\partial_z (\delta_t e_{3,h}^m + \delta_t e_{3,i}^m)\, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) := J_1 + J_2$$

Since J_2 is easier to bound than J_1, we only bound J_1 (by using the inverse inequalities $\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{H^1_{\mathbf{x}}} \leq C\, h^{-1}\, \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2_{\mathbf{x}}}$ and $\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^\infty_{\mathbf{x}}} \leq C\, h^{-1}\, \|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{L^2_{\mathbf{x}}}$):

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 &\leq 2\,k\|\delta_t e^m_{3,h} + \delta_t e^m_{3,i}\|_{L^\infty_z L^2_{\mathbf{x}}}\, \|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{L^2_z L^\infty_{\mathbf{x}}}\, \|\partial_z\, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{L^2_z L^2_{\mathbf{x}}} \\
&\leq C\,k\Big(\|\delta_t e^m_h\| + \|\delta_t e^m_i\| + \frac{h^2}{k}\int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} \|\partial_t u_3\|_{H^3}\Big)\frac{1}{h}\,|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|\,\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\| \\
&\leq C\,k\,\Big(\frac{1}{h}|\delta_t \mathbf{e}^m_h| + \frac{h^2}{k}\int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} (\|\mathbf{u}_t\|_{H^3} + \|\partial_t u_3\|_{H^3})\Big)\frac{1}{h}\,|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|\,\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\| \\
&\leq \varepsilon\, k\,\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2 + C\,k\,\frac{1}{h^4}\Big(|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \mathbf{e}_h^m|^2 + |\mathbf{e}_h^m|^2\Big)|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^m|^2 \\
&+ C\,h^2\left(\int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} \|\mathbf{U}_t\|^2_{H^3}\right)\Big(|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \mathbf{e}_h^m|^2 + |\mathbf{e}_h^m|^2\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that to apply the discrete Gronwall's Lemma with the term $C\,k\,\frac{1}{h^4}\,|\mathbf{e}_h^m|^2\,|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^m|^2$, it is necessary that $k\,\frac{1}{h^4}\,\sum_m |\mathbf{e}_h^m|^2 \leq C$ and this is true for $l = 2$. In Section 6 below, we will see a modified scheme where it is possible to obtain optimal error estimates $O(k + h^l)$ for $l = 1$.

On the other hand, we have to bound

$$\begin{aligned}
c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^{m-1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}^{m+1/2}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) &= c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^{m-1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) \\
&= -c\Big(\mathbf{E}^{m-1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) + c\Big(\mathbf{U}(t_{m-1}), \delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

(here we have used that $c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^{m-1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) = 0$). The more complicate term is the vertical part:

$$\begin{aligned}
&2\,k\,c\Big(e_3^{m-1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}\Big) \\
&= 2\,k\Big((e^{m-1}_{3,h} + e^{m-1}_{3,i})\,\delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \partial_z\,\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) - k\Big(\partial_z(e^{m-1}_{3,h} + e^{m-1}_{3,i})\,\delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\Big) := K_1 + K_2
\end{aligned}$$

Since K_2 is easier to bound than K_1, we only bound K_1:

$$\begin{aligned}
K_1 &\leq 2\,k\,\|e^{m-1}_{3,h} + e^{m-1}_{3,i}\|_{L^\infty_z L^2_{\mathbf{x}}}\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}\|_{L^2_z L^2_{\mathbf{x}}}\|\partial_z \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{L^2_z L^\infty_{\mathbf{x}}} \\
&\leq C\,k\,(\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m-1}\| + h^2\,\|\mathbf{U}(t_{m-1})\|_{H^3})\,h^2 k^{-1}(\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \|\mathbf{u}_t(t_{m+1})\|_{H^2})\,h^{-1}\,\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\| \\
&\leq \varepsilon\,k\,\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|^2 + C\,h^2\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \|\mathbf{u}_t(t_{m+1})\|^2_{H^2}(\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m-1}\|^2 + h^2).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, making $2\,k\,\Big((D_2)_h^m, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2 - |\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2 + |\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2 \\
&+k\left\{\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|^2 - \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2 + \|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|^2\right\} = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Reasoning as in Theorem 6, adding (31) and (32) from $m = 0$ to r (with any $r < M$), taking into account the previous estimates and choising ε and k small enough, we can apply the discrete Gronwall's Lemma obtaining the desired estimates. ∎

4.8.2 $O(k+h^2)$ error estimates for $\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}$ in $l^\infty(\mathbf{L}^2)\cap l^2(\mathbf{H}^1)$

Theorem 11 *Under hypotheses of Theorem 10 and* **(R5)**, *assuming the following hypothesis for the first step of the scheme*

$$|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^1| \leq C\,(k+h^2),$$

then

$$\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{l^\infty(\mathbf{L}^2)\cap l^2(\mathbf{H}^1)} \leq C\,(k+h^2).$$

Proof. The main idea is to make $2\,k\left((D_3)_h^{m+1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\right)$. Now, the pressure term vanish but the term $c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^{m-1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) \neq 0$ and can be decomposed as:

$$\begin{aligned}
&2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^{m-1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) = 2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{U}_h^{m-1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)\\
&= -2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{E}^{m-1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) + 2\,k\,c\Big(\mathbf{U}(t_{m-1}), \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) := I_1 + I_2.
\end{aligned}$$

The more complicate term in I_1 is the vertical part:

$$\begin{aligned}
&k\left((e_{3,h}^{m-1} + e_{3,i}^{m-1})\,(\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}), \partial_z \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\right)\\
&\leq k\|e_{3,h}^{m-1} + e_{3,i}^{m-1}\|_{L_z^\infty L_{\mathbf{x}}^2}\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{L_z^2 L_{\mathbf{x}}^\infty}\|\partial_z \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{L_z^2 L_{\mathbf{x}}^2}\\
&\leq \frac{k}{h^2}|\mathbf{e}_h^{m-1}|\,|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|\,\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\| + \frac{k}{h}\|\mathbf{e}_i^{m-1}\|\,|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|\,\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|\\
&+C\frac{k}{h}\,\|e_{3,i}^{m-1}\|_{L_z^\infty L_{\mathbf{x}}^2}\,|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|\,\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|\\
&\leq \varepsilon\,k\,\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|^2 + C\,\frac{k}{h^4}|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2\;|\mathbf{e}_h^{m-1}|^2\\
&+C\,k\,h^2\,|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2
\end{aligned}$$

(here, we have used the inverse inequalities $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{L_{\mathbf{x}}^\infty} \leq C\,h^{-1}\,|\mathbf{v}|_{L_{\mathbf{x}}^2}$ and $\|\mathbf{v}\| \leq C\,h^{-1}\,|\mathbf{v}|$ and the estimates (21) and (23)). Since $|\mathbf{e}_h^{m-1}|^2 \leq C\,(k^2+h^4)$, adding the third term of the RHS of the previous inequality,

$$C\,k\,h^{-4}\sum_m |\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2 |\mathbf{e}_h^{m-1}|^2 \leq C\,k\,h^{-4}(k+h^4)(k^2+h^4) \leq C\,(k^2+h^4),$$

where (**H**) and estimates of Theorem 10 have been used.

The more complicate term in I_2 is the vertical part:

$$2\,k\,c\Big(u_3(t_{m-1}), \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}, \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) \leq \varepsilon\,k\,\|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|^2 + C\,k\,|\delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \delta_t \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2.$$

Adding from $m=0$ to r (with any $r < M$), we can apply the discrete Gronwall's Lemma obtaining the desired estimates. ∎

Again, from estimates of previous Theorems and applying the hydrostatic *Inf-Sup* condition **(H1)**, we arrive at the following optimal error estimate for the pressure.

Corollary 12 *Assuming hypotheses of Theorem 11, one has*

$$\|e_{p,h}^{m+1}\|_{l^2(L^2)} \leq C\,(k+h^2).$$

Notice that the previous estimate for the pressure is not obtained in the $l^\infty(L^2)$ norm, due to the convective term depending on the intermediate error $\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}$ which has not optimal approximation in $l^\infty(\mathbf{L}^2)$, only in $l^2(\mathbf{L}^2)$.

5 A modified scheme with integral computation for the vertical velocity.

In this section, we will approximate the problem (Q). We consider the variational formulation of (Q) satisfied for the exact solution $(\mathbf{u}, p_s)$ at $t = t_{m+1}$:

$$(Q)_w^{m+1} \qquad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Big(\frac{1}{k}(\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}) - \mathbf{u}(t_m)), \mathbf{v}\Big) + c\Big(\mathbf{U}(t_m), \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), \mathbf{v}\Big) + \Big(\nabla \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), \nabla \mathbf{v}\Big) \\ -\Big(p_s(t_{m+1}), \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{v} \rangle\Big)_S = \Big\langle \mathbf{f}(t_{m+1}), \mathbf{v} \Big\rangle_\Omega + \Big\langle \mathbf{g}_s(t_{m+1}), \mathbf{v} \Big\rangle_{\Gamma_s} + \Big(\mathcal{E}^{m+1}, \mathbf{v}\Big) \\ \Big(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \langle \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}) \rangle, q\Big)_S = 0, \end{array} \right.$$

for each $(\mathbf{v}, q) \in \Big(\mathbf{W}_{b,l}^{1,3} \cap \mathbf{L}^\infty\Big) \times L_0^2(S)$, where

$$u_3(t_m; \mathbf{x}, z) = \int_z^0 \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{u}(t_m; \mathbf{x}, s)\, ds.$$

5.1 $O(k + h^{l+1})$ for $\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}$ in $l^2(\mathbf{L}^2)$

We change in the scheme the computation of the vertical velocity $u_{3,h}^m$ in $(S_0)_h^{m+1}$, replacing Sub-step 0 by the vertical integral computation

$$u_{3,h}^m(\mathbf{x}, z) = \int_z^0 \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{u}_h^m(\mathbf{x}, s)\, ds.$$

Accordingly, we will change the vertical interpolation operator as follows

$$\overline{K}_h u_3(\mathbf{x}, z) = \int_z^0 \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot I_h \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, s)\, ds,$$

hence $e_{3,i}^m = \int_z^0 \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{e}_i^m$. This interpolation operator $\overline{K}_h$ conserves the properties already used for the interpolation K_h and consequently, properties (20)-(23) can be used in this context.

Theorem 13 *Assuming hypotheses of Theorem 7,* (**R3**) *and* $\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^0\| \leq C\, h^{l+1}$ *(recall that* A_h *is the discrete hydrostatic Stokes operator used in (15)), then there exists* $k_0 > 0$ *such that for any* $k \leq k_0$*, the following error estimates hold*

$$\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{l^2(\mathbf{L}^2)} \leq C(k + h^{l+1}). \tag{33}$$

Proof. Taking $\mathbf{v}_h = A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} \in \mathbf{V}_h$ in $(E)_h^{m+1}$, we obtain

$$\begin{array}{l} \|A_h^{-1}\, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|^2 - \|A_h^{-1}\, \mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2 + \|A_h^{-1}\, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} - A_h^{-1}\, \mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2 + 2\, k |\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2 \\ \leq 2\, k\, \mathbf{NL}_h^{m+1}(A_h^{-1}\, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}) - 2\, k\Big(\delta_t \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) + 2\, k\Big(\mathcal{E}^{m+1}, A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) := I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{array}$$

We bound the more complicate terms of I_1:

$$2\, k\, c\Big(u_{3,h}^m, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) = -2\, k\, c\Big(e_{3,h}^m, \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big)$$

$$+2\, k\, c\Big(u_3(t_m), \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\Big) := L_1 + L_2$$

By using the inverse inequalities $\|\mathbf{e}_h\|_{L^3} \leq h^{-1/2}|\mathbf{e}_h|$ in $3D$-domains and $\|\mathbf{e}_h\|_{L^\infty_{\mathbf{x}}} \leq h^{-1}\|\mathbf{e}_h\|_{L^2_{\mathbf{x}}}$ in $2D$-domains:

$$\begin{aligned}
L_1 &= k\left(\partial_z e^m_{3,h}\,\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\right) - 2\,k\left(e^m_{3,h}\,\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}, \partial_z A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\right)\\
&\leq k\left(\|\partial_z e^m_{3,h}\|_{L^2}\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{L^3}\,\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{L^6} + 2\,\|e^m_{3,h}\|_{L^\infty_z\,L^2_{\mathbf{x}}}\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}\|_{L^2_z\,L^\infty_{\mathbf{x}}}\,\|\partial_z A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{L^2_z\,L^2_{\mathbf{x}}}\right)\\
&\leq C\,k\left(\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\| + \|\mathbf{e}_i^m\|\right)(h^{-1/2}+h^{-1})\left(|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} - \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}| + |\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|\right)\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|\\
&\leq \varepsilon\,k\,|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2 + \varepsilon\,k|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} - \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2}|^2 + C\frac{k}{h^2}\left(\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2 + h^{2l}\right)\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
L_2 &\leq C\,k\left(\|u_3(t_m)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\partial_z u_3(t_m)\|_{L^3}\right)\left(|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}| + |\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|\right)\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|\\
&\leq \varepsilon\,k\left(|\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2 + |\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1/2} - \mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}|^2\right) + C\,k\,\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The vertical part of $2\,k\,c\left(\mathbf{U}_h^m, \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\right)$ is

$$2\,k\,c\left(u^m_{3,h}, \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\right) = 2\,k\,c\left(e^m_{3,h} + e^m_{3,i}, \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\right) - 2\,k\,c\left(u_3(t_m), \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\right)$$

and its more complicate term is

$$2\,k\,c\left(e^m_{3,h}, \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\right) = 2\,k\left(e^m_{3,h}\,\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, \partial_z A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\right) + k\left(\partial_z e^m_{3,h}\,\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\right) := N_1 + N_2$$

We bound

$$\begin{aligned}
N_1 &\leq k\,\|e^m_{3,h}\|_{L^\infty_z L^2_{\mathbf{x}}}\,\|\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}\|_{L^2_z L^2_{\mathbf{x}}}\,\|\partial_z A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{L^2 L^\infty_{\mathbf{x}}} \leq C\,k\,\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|\,|\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}|\,h^{-1}\,\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|\\
&\leq C\,\frac{k}{h^2}\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2\,\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|^2 + C\,k\,h^{2(l+1)},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
N_2 &\leq k\,\|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\mathbf{e}_h^m\|_{L^3}\|\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}\|_{L^2}\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{L^6} \leq C\,k\,h^{-1/2}\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|\,|\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}|\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|\\
&\leq C\,\frac{k}{h}\|\mathbf{e}_h^m\|^2\,\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|^2 + C\,k\,h^{2(l+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, by a similar way, we bound

$$\begin{aligned}
2\,k\,c\left(e^m_{3,i}, \mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}, A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\right) &\leq C\,k\left(\|\mathbf{e}_i^m\|\,|\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}|\,h^{-1}\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\| + h^{-1/2}\|\mathbf{e}_i^m\|\,|\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}|\,\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|\right)\\
&\leq C\,k\,|\mathbf{e}_i^{m+1}|\,\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\| \leq C\,k\,\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|^2 + C\,k\,h^{2(l+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Other conflictive term of I_1 is:

$$2\,k\,c\left(e^m_{3,h}, \mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\right) = 2\,k\left(e^m_{3,h}\,\partial_z\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\right) + k\left(\partial_z e^m_{3,h}\,\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\right) := J_1 + J_2$$

To bound J_1, it is necessary the explicit expression of $e^m_{3,h} = \int_z^0 \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\mathbf{e}_h^m = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot\int_z^0\mathbf{e}_h^m$ which let us to integrate by parts,

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 &= k\left(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\cdot(\int_z^0\mathbf{e}_h^m)\,\partial_z\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1}), A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\right)\\
&= -k\left(\int_z^0\mathbf{e}_h^m, \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\partial_z\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})\,A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1} + \partial_z\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})\,\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\right)\\
&\leq k\,\|\int_z^0\mathbf{e}_h^m\|_{L^\infty_z L^2_{\mathbf{x}}}\left(\|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\partial_z\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})\|_{L^{6/5}_z L^3_{\mathbf{x}}}\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{L^6_z L^6_{\mathbf{x}}} + \|\partial_z\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})\|_{L^2_z L^\infty_{\mathbf{x}}}\|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|_{L^2_z L^2_{\mathbf{x}}}\right)\\
&\leq \varepsilon\,k\,|\mathbf{e}_h^m|^2 + C\,k\,\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}_h^{m+1}\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

In a similar way, by using that $\partial_z e^m_{3,h} = -\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \mathbf{e}^m_h$,

$$\begin{aligned} J_2 &\leq k\,|\mathbf{e}^m_h|\Big(\|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})\|_{L^3}\,\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}^{m+1}_h\|_{L^6} + \|\mathbf{u}(t_{m+1})\|_{L^\infty}|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}^{m+1}_h|\Big) \\ &\leq \varepsilon\, k\,|\mathbf{e}^m_h|^2 + C\,k\,\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}^{m+1}_h\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we bound the I_2-term as follows

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= -2\,k\Big(\delta_t\mathbf{e}^{m+1}_i, A_h^{-1}\,\mathbf{e}^{m+1}_h\Big) \leq C\,k\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}^{m+1}_h\|^2 + \varepsilon\,k|\mathbf{e}_i(\delta_t\mathbf{u}^{m+1})|^2 \\ &\leq C\,k\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}^{m+1}_h\|^2 + \varepsilon\,k\,h^{2(l+1)}\|\delta_t\mathbf{u}^{m+1}\|^2_{H^{l+1}} \\ &\leq C\,k\,\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{e}^{m+1}_h\|^2 + \varepsilon\,h^{2(l+1)}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}}\|\mathbf{u}_t\|^2_{H^{l+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the I_3-term is easy to bound by using that $\mathbf{u}_{tt} \in L^2(\mathbf{L}^2)$ given by hypothesis (**R3**).

Adding from $m = 0$ to r (for any $r < M$), since one has $\|\mathbf{e}^m_h\|^2 \leq C\,h^2$ and $k\sum_m |\mathbf{e}^{m+1/2}_h - \mathbf{e}^m_h|^2 \leq Ck(k + h^{2l}) \leq C(k^2 + h^{2(l+1)})$ owing to (**H**), we can apply the generalized discrete Gronwall's Lemma, obtaining the desired estimates for k small enough. ■

5.2 $O(k + h^l)$ for $e^{m+1}_{p,h}$ in $l^2(L^2)$

Owing to the improved error estimate obtained in the above Subsection, now we can prove the same error estimates obtained in Theorems 10 and 11 also for $l = 1$, that is, using $O(h)$ FE-approximation.

Indeed, in the proof of Theorem 10, we can apply the discrete Gronwall's Lemma, since the term $C\,k\,h^{-4}\sum_{m=0}^{r}|\mathbf{e}^m_h|^2\,|\delta_t\mathbf{e}^m_h|^2$ appear, and now for $l = 1$, owing to (33) and (**H**), we have

$$C\,k\,\frac{1}{h^4}\sum_{m=0}^{r}|\mathbf{e}^m_h|^2 \leq C.$$

The rest of the proof is similar, arriving at the following result:

Corollary 14 *Assuming hypotheses of Theorem 11 and Theorem 13, one has*

$$\|e^{m+1}_{p,h}\|_{l^2(L^2)} \leq C\,(k + h^l).$$

6 Approximation of the Coriolis term

Looking at the results obtained in previous Sections, we consider that the more convenient forms to introduce the Coriolis term in the scheme can be the following (the Coriolis term will be always refereed at the end-of-step velocity, either $\mathbf{u}^{m+1}_h$ or $\mathbf{u}^m_h$, because it is the better approximation in the scheme):

1. Considering in $(S_1)^{m+1}_h$ the explicit term $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{u}^m_h)$. In the proof of Lemma 2, this term introduces the extra-term

$$\Big(\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{u}^m_h), \mathbf{u}^{m+1/2}_h\Big) = \Big(\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{u}^m_h), \mathbf{u}^{m+1/2}_h - \mathbf{u}^m_h\Big)$$

which produces an artificial exponential bound in time in the stability estimates. Indeed, bounding as

$$\left(\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{u}_h^m), \mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2} - \mathbf{u}_h^m\right) \leq C\,|\mathbf{u}_h^m|^2 + \varepsilon|\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2} - \mathbf{u}_h^m|^2$$

and applying the discrete Gronwall inequality, a new exponential bound appears. With respect to the error estimates, some new terms in $(E_1)_h^{m+1}$ and in $(E_2)_h^{m+1}$ appear, although these terms do not add new difficulties.

2. Considering the following Coriolis correction strategy: to introduce in $(S_1)_h^{m+1}$ the explicit term $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{u}_h^m)$ and in $(S_2)_h^{m+1}$ the correction term $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1} - \mathbf{u}_h^m)$. This correction scheme works in a similar way to scheme given in point 1 with respect to the stability and error estimates.

Notice that in the two previous cases, the computation of the two components of velocity $\mathbf{u}_h^{m+1/2}$ is decoupled. Finally, the implementation of Hydrostatic Stokes step (Sub-step 2) is simpler in the case 1.

7 Conclusions

In this paper we have developed two new ways of handling stable and convergent approximations for the Primitive Equations, based on the reformulations (Q) and (R) of the problem, being (Q) an integral-differential formulation and (R) a fully differential one.

In both cases, vertically structured meshes are needed, and the error estimates are deduced under the same constraint $k \leq h^2$.

With respect to computational implementation, scheme based on (R) is simpler than scheme related to (Q), although the latter satisfies more analytical error estimates. In fact, (Q)-scheme satisfies optimal accuracy $O(k + h^{l+1})$ in the $L^2(\Omega)$-norm for the velocity and $O(k + h^l)$ in the $H^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$-norm for the velocity and pressure, whereas for the (R)-scheme this optimal accuracy can be proved only in the $H^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega)$-norm for the velocity and pressure when $l = 2$, that is, using $O(h^2)$ FE-approximation.

Nevertheless, the constraint $k \leq h^2$, imposed in both schemes, is compatible with the accuracy $O(k + h^2)$ which is satisfied in the $H^1 \times L^2$-norm for velocity and pressure when $l = 2$ and only in the L^2-norm for the velocity when $l = 1$. Therefore, by using $O(h^2)$ FE-approximation ($l = 2$) is more convenient the (R)-scheme because is simpler to implement.

Appendix

Proof [of Lemma 5]: Let $A^{-1}\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}$ be the solution of the hydrostatic Stokes Problem with second member $\mathbf{v}$. This solution verifies (see [16] for the Stokes case)

$$\|A^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h - A_h^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h\| \leq C\,h\,|\mathbf{v}_h|. \tag{34}$$

On the other hand,

$$\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h\|_{W^{1,6}} \leq \|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h - \widetilde{I}_h A^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h\|_{W^{1,6}} + \|\widetilde{I}_h\, A^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h\|_{W^{1,6}}$$

where $\widetilde{I}_h$ is an interpolator with respect to $\mathbf{X}_h$.

We bound the RHS as follows, using hypothesis **(H0)**, the stability property $\|\widetilde{I}_h\mathbf{v}_h\|_{W^{1,6}} \leq C\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{W^{1,6}}$ and the inverse inequality $\|\mathbf{v}_h\|_{W^{1,6}} \leq C\,h^{-1}\|\mathbf{v}_h\|$:

$$\|\widetilde{I}_h A^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h\|_{W^{1,6}} \leq C\,\|A^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h\|_{W^{1,6}} \leq C\|A^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h\|_{H^2} \leq C\,|\mathbf{v}_h|,$$

$$\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h - \widetilde{I}_h A^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h\|_{W^{1,6}} \leq \frac{C}{h}\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h - \widetilde{I}_h A^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h\| \leq \frac{C}{h}\Big(\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h - A^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h\| + \|A^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h - \widetilde{I}_h A^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h\|\Big).$$

Finally, applying (34) and the error interpolation inequality

$$\|A^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h - \widetilde{I}_h\, A^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h\| \leq C\, h\, \|A^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h\|_{H^2} \leq C\, h|\mathbf{v}_h|,$$

we arrive at $\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h - \widetilde{I}_h\, A^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h\|_{W^{1,6}} \leq C\,|\mathbf{v}_h|$. Therefore, we conclude

$$\|A_h^{-1}\mathbf{v}_h\|_{W^{1,6}} \leq C\,|\mathbf{v}_h|.$$

References

[1] P. Azérad, F. Guillén. *Équations de Navier-Stokes en bassin peu profond: l'approximation hydrostatique.* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Série I **329** (1999), 961-966.

[2] P. Azérad, F. Guillén. *Mathematical justification of the hydrostatic approximation in the primitive equations of geophysical fluid dynamics* Siam J. Math. Anal., **33** (4) (2001), 847-859.

[3] R. Bermejo. *Velocity Error Estimates for a Semi-Lagrangian Ocean General Circulation Model.* Actas de las II Jornadas de Análisis de Variables y Simulación Numérica del Intercambio de Masas de Agua a través del Estrecho de Gibraltar, Cádiz, (2000), 19-34.

[4] R. Bermejo, P. Galán del Sastre. *Long-Term Behavior of the Wind Stress Circulation of a Numerical North Atlantic Ocean Circulation Model.* European Congress on Computational Methods in Applied Sciences and Engineering, ECCOMAS (2004), 1-21.

[5] O. Besson, M. R. Laydi. *Some Estimates for the Anisotropic Navier-Stokes Equations and for the Hydrostatic Approximation.* M2AN-Mod. Math. Ana. Num., **7** (1992) 855-865.

[6] J. Blasco, R Codina, A. Huerta. *A fractional-step method for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations related to a predictor-multicorrector algorithm.* Internat. J. Numer. Methods Fluids, **28** (10) (1998), 1391–1419.

[7] C. Cao, E.S. Titi. *Global well-posedness of the three-dimensional viscous primitive equations of large scale ocean and atmosphere dynamics.* Annals of Mathematics, **166**(1) (2007), 245-267.

[8] V. Casulli, R.T. Cheng. *Semi-implicit finite difference methods for three-dimensional sahllow water flow.* Internat. J. Numer. Methods Fluids, **15**, (1992) 629-648.

[9] V. Casulli, E. Cattani. *Stability, Accuracy and Efficiency of a semi-implicit method for tree-dimensional shallow water flow.* Comp. Math. Applic., **27**, 4 (1994) 99-112.

[10] V. Casulli, R.A.. Walters. *A robust finite element model for hydrostatic surface water flows.* Communications in Numerical Methods in Engineering, **14**, (1998) 931-940.

[11] B.Cushman-Roisin, J.M. Beckers. *Introduction to Geophysical Fluid Dynamics - Physical and Numerical Aspects.* Academic Press, 2009.

[12] T. Chacón, F. Guillén. *An intrinsic analysis of existence of solutions for the hydrostatic approximation of Navier-Stokes equations.* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Série I **329** (2000), 841-846.

[13] T. Chacón; D. Rodríguez-Gómez. *A stabilized space-time discretization for the primitive equations in oceanography.* Numer. Math., **98** (3) (2004), 427-475.

[14] T. Chacón; D. Rodríguez-Gómez. *A numerical solver for the primitive equations of the ocean using term-by-term stabilization.* Appl. Numer. Math., **55** (1) (2005), 1-31.

[15] T. Chacón Rebollo, M. Gómez Mármol, I. Sánchez Muñoz. *Numerical solution of the Primitive Equations of the ocean by the Orthogonal Sub-Scales VMS method.* Appl. Numer. Math. **62** (2012) 342-359.

[16] V. Girault, P.A. Raviart. *Finite Element Methods for Navier-Stokes Equations.* Springer-Verlag, 1986.

[17] R. Glowinski, Numerical Methods for Fluids (Part 3), Handbook of Numerical Analysis, vol. IX, P. G. Ciarlet and J. L. Lions, eds., North-Holland, 2003.

[18] F. Guillén-González, N. Masmoudi, M.A. Rodríguez-Bellido. *Anisotropic Estimates and strong solutions of the Primitive Equations* J. Diff. Integral Equations, **14** (11) (2001), 1381-1408.

[19] F. Guillén-González, M. V. Redondo-Neble, J. R. Rodríguez-Galván *Análisis Numérico y resolución efectiva de las Ecuaciones Primitivas con esquemas de tipo proyección.* Actas del XVII CEDYA/ VII CMA, Universidad de Salamanca (2001).

[20] F. Guillén, M.A. Rodríguez-Bellido. *On the strong solutions of the Primitive Equations in* $2D$ *domains.* Nonlinear Analysis: Serie A, Theory and Methods, **50** (5) (2002), 621-646.

[21] F. Guillén-González, D. Rodríguez-Gómez. *Bubble finite elements for the primitive equations of the ocean.* Num. Math., **101** (4) (2005), 689-728.

[22] F. Guillén-González, M.V. Redondo-Neble. *Sharp error estimates for a fractional-step method applied to the* $3D$ *Navier-Stokes equations.* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I **345** (2007), 359-362.

[23] F. Guillén-González, J.V. Gutiérrez-Santacreu. *Conditional stability and convergence of a fully discrete scheme for* $3D$ *viscous fluids models with mass diffusion.* SIAM J. Num. Anal., **46** (5) (2008), 2276-2308.

[24] F. Guillén-González, M.V. Redondo-Neble. *New error estimates for a viscosity-splitting scheme in time for the* $3D$ *Navier-Stokes equations.* IMA J. Numer. Anal. (2011) **31** (2), 556-579.

[25] F. Guillén-González, M.V. Redondo-Neble. *Spatial error estimates for a finite element viscosity-splitting scheme for the Navier-Stokes equations.* Int. J. Numer. Anal. Mod. **10** (4) (2013), 826-844.

[26] J.G. Heywood, R. Rannacher. *Finite element approximation of the nonstationary Navier-Stokes problem. IV. Error analysis for second order time discretization.* SIAM J. Numer. Anal., **27** (1990), 353-384.

[27] I. Kukavica, M. Ziane. *On the regularity of the primitive equations of the ocean.* Nonlinearity, **20** (2007), 2739-2753.

[28] R. Lewandowski. *Analyse Mathématique et Océanographie.* Masson (1997).

[29] J.L. Lions, R. Teman, S. Wang. *New formulations of the primitives equations of the atmosphere and applications.* Nonlinearity, **5** (1992), 237-288.

[30] J.L. Lions, R. Teman, S. Wang. *On the equations of the large scale Ocean.* Nonlinearity, **5** (1992), 1007-1053.

[31] F. Ortegón Gallego. *On distributions independent of* x_N *in certain non-cylindrical domains and a de Rham lemma with a non-local constraint.* Nonlinear Analysis, **59** (2004), 335-345.

[32] J. Pedlosky. *Geophysical fluid dynamics.* Springer-Verlag (1987).

[33] J. Simon. *Compact sets in* $L^p(0,T;B)$, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl., **146** (1987), 65–97.

[34] R. Temam, Navier-Stokes equations. Theory and Numerical Analysis, North-Holland, 1984.

[35] M. Ziane. *Regularity Results for Stokes Type Systems.* Applicable Analysis, **58** (1995), 263-292.